Cardinal Beaton

Priest and Politician

John Herkless

UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE
3 1761 01994159 0

CARDINAL BEATON

LIBRARY

CARDINAL BEATON

PRIEST AND POLITICIAN

BY

JOHN HERKLESS

MINISTER OF TANNADICE

WITH A PORTRAIT

WILLIAM BLACKWOOD AND SONS
EDINBURGH AND LONDON
MDCCCXCI

CONTENTS.

CHAP.		PAGE
I.	THE DECLINE OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN SCOTLAND,	1
II.	THE OLD ALLIANCE AND THE OLD ENMITY,	33
III.	EARLY INFLUENCES ON BEATON'S CHARACTER,	59
IV.	BEATON AND PATRICK HAMILTON,	81
V.	DIPLOMACY,	108
VI.	THE EXTIRPATION OF HERESY,	140
VII.	REFORMATION FROM ENGLAND,	161
VIII.	SOLWAY MOSS AND ITS SEQUEL,	189
IX.	FURTHER INTRIGUES,	212
X.	KING AGAINST CARDINAL,	242
XI.	PROTESTANTISM AND WISHART,	273
XII.	THE ASSASSINATION OF BEATON,	302

CARDINAL BEATON.

CHAPTER I.

THE DECLINE OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN SCOTLAND.

THREE centuries and a half have passed since the burning of George Wishart, the event which has made the name of Cardinal Beaton the name most execrated in the ecclesiastical history of Scotland. In Knox's words, Beaton was "that bloody wolf the Cardinal," "a vitious priest and wicked monster which neither minded God nor cared for man." As Knox has made hatred of Popery one of the virtues of Scottish Protestantism, this verdict on the character of Wishart's destroyer is acceptable to those who hold that the "blessed martyr of God" was a saint without reproach.

Beaton, moreover, having been the chief enemy of the Scottish Reformation, has been awarded, in literature and tradition, an evil reputation, great in proportion to the cause which he opposed. Even were this reputation, however, wholly deserved, the man was more than a destroyer of heretics, and more than an enemy of the Lutheran faith.

Beaton was the representative and most notable man of Catholic Scotland of the sixteenth century, and was by title, at the time of his death, Lord Chancellor of the kingdom, Archbishop of St Andrews, and Cardinal Legate in Scotland. In the history of his country, whatever his personal character may have been, he takes his place as the last great churchman and statesman before the Reformation, and almost the last politician to keep Scotland within the circle of European interests.

Modern research has often been able to discredit the veracity of tradition. Cromwell, by the genius of Carlyle, appears no longer before the bar of history as the religious hypocrite who murdered his king; but since even Judge Jeffreys has had his advocate, it may appear as if later writers formed a Court of Appeal to reverse all generally accepted judgments.

History, however, is concerned with doing justice, and not with commuting truth into fiction. Literature itself, like tradition, has not always represented men and events as they appear in the light of an inquest into facts; but against the best literature, historical criticism is powerless. Shakspere's Macbeth and Richard III. have established themselves in most minds secure against eviction by the Macbeth of the Chronicles and the Richard of the Histories. When, moreover, written history and literature, contemporary with their victim, are agreed in a censure, such condemnation may seem beyond dispute. Thus Knox and Sir David Lindsay, in their disparaging of Beaton, are apt to be accounted witnesses whose testimony is not to be traversed. These writers, however, carried religious prejudice and personal hatred, the one into history, and the other into literature; and whatever be their position among Scottish men of letters, they were singularly unfitted for a calm and rational judgment on the character of a religious opponent. Knox's history, in so far as it is the work of the Reformer, was written by one who would not lie; but no narrative of events and controversies, in which the narrator had a leader's share, is

above the suspicion of party bias. On the other hand, the assertions of Lindsay, in his Tragedy of the Cardinal, are not, in fairness, to be tested by the canons of literal accuracy. These two writers are mainly responsible for the popular opinion and traditions regarding Beaton; but the modern student who can rise above sectarian feeling, and at the same time resist the fashion which aims at reversing accepted judgments on men of the past, may, without insult to the sincerity of Knox and the good faith of Lindsay, come to doubt the traditions concerning Beaton, and to see in him one who, though a worldly ecclesiastic, was the zealous guardian of his Church, and the ablest Scottish statesman of his day.

Beaton, as a leader in Church and State, had no easy task in the work of his twofold office. The Catholic Church was suffering exposure under the light of the Renascence, and direct attack from the forces of Protestantism.

Henry VIII., moved by anger against Rome, was seeking to spread in Scotland those reforms which he found convenient for a king in England. Moreover, Scotland was still an object, as it had been in former times, of the cupidity of the King of England, and its independence

was again in danger. Nor was Scotland isolated from European politics. The King of France and the Emperor Charles, each of them in his jealousy of Henry VIII., sought her alliance; and to them in turn she looked for aid against England.

The memorable events of the first half of the sixteenth century were many, and European history seemed then to be in haste: but these events can be fully understood only through a knowledge of antecedent facts; and in the history of Scotland, Beaton and his times can become an intelligible volume only by reference to events and policies not confined within the limits of the century. There are three outstanding facts of this kind which throw light on the history of the period that marks the close of medieval Scotland, and on the policies of the leader in Church and State of that period. The decline of the Catholic Church, the ancient Scoto-French alliance, and the long-continued enmity between Scotland and England, are the three important facts which demand examination at the outset.

The date of the Scottish Reformation is later than that of Germany or England; but this is largely to be explained by the Scottish policy

of Henry VIII., and by the dominant influence of Beaton, who ruled the councils of his nation. In Germany the Reformation was at first purely religious; afterwards it was political as well as religious, if the Peasants' War is to be accounted part of the general Reformation movement. In England the first Reformation dates from Henry's search for a divorce court, since "gospel light first dawn'd from Bullen's eyes"; and among the outward and visible signs of a change in the religion of the land were the erection of the scaffold, the kindling of the fires for sacrifices, and the plunder of the monasteries. In Scotland the spiritual revolution, after the murder of Beaton, was accompanied by violence to stone and lime. That murder was not applauded by the people as a whole; and so short was the time between it and the destruction of the ancient national faith, that Beaton must be held to have been the last support of the Catholic Church.

Knox, like every leader of a revolution, did his work with speed, because the forces of destruction were ready to his hand. He was strong, and the thoroughness of the Scottish Reformation was largely due to his strength; but the Church was doomed before his day,

and waited but the coming of the destroyer. Drastic legislation might have removed ecclesiastical abuses, and without sudden revolution the paramount influence of the clergy in the State might have ceased as laymen gradually grew in capacity; but an institution corrupt in practice and irritating because of its privileges and monopolies, an institution which demanded and exercised absolute authority over the individual conscience, was, in spite of the divine origin claimed for it, certain to be overthrown whenever spiritual freedom came to be numbered among the rights of the people.

To show under what variety of circumstance a nation progresses towards freedom is the highest function of the historian. In a barbaric age political and spiritual liberty are alike impossible to a people; but progress is made from barbarism as the manifold institutions of slavery are seen to be inadequate to the needs and rights of human life. By the natural law of progress the Catholic Church in Scotland, the complex organ of Papal authority, was doomed to destruction or death, since the people, whose best and excellent traditions were those of national independence, were, by

centuries of struggle for political liberty, preparing themselves for freedom from the foreign authority and the spiritual tyranny of the Pope.

The work of vandalism, however, so effectively performed by Knox's zealots, was no proof of a popular recognition of the right or meaning of spiritual freedom. That recognition is subject also to the law of progress, and therefore the incidents of the Reformation must be traced to causes not wholly spiritual. The incubus of the priesthood, and especially of the monkish orders, was a burden so grievous to the people that it was a delight to them to throw it off when the invitation came from Knox. Many, too, had grown weary of the saints, and were ready to welcome the written Gospel. Modern miracles, indulgences, and legends of saints had ceased to satisfy any but the most credulous; and results show that the Scots were fitted to receive spiritual teaching which demanded not credulity but intelligence. The Scottish Reformation was an appeal to men who had shown their worth in their battles for liberty. This appeal was not made from persuasive lips till it came from Knox; nor could it have been made with hope of effect while Henry VIII., the patron of reformation, was

menacing the independence of Scotland, and Beaton was ruling Church and State. Though Henry VIII. advised his nephew, the Scottish king, to enrich himself by the demolition of the monasteries, and afterwards gave the same advice to the nobles and the prelates; though immorality among the clergy was exposed and satirised by Dunbar, Lindsay, and Buchanan; though Patrick Hamilton and martyrs of less renown had died,—Beaton delayed the Church's doom till his own death had come. To the Cardinal, however, the cause of the Church never seemed the forlorn-hope of the Pope's battle. Leaving France, where the authority of Rome in things spiritual, if not in things ecclesiastical, was supreme, he returned to Scotland, where the influence of the Church and of churchmen was universal. Throughout his career in Scotland that influence was assailed; but at no time in the course of his life were there signs of the sudden and crushing ruin which at last overtook the Church. He hoped that in Scotland, as well as in other countries, the new faith would be stamped out; and though he saw the spread of the Lutheran doctrines, he did not cease to believe that the glory of the ancient Church

would yet be restored. After his death, when there was no one to check the lawless and covetous nobles, the signs of the impending downfall were manifest; and though Beaton could not foresee what was coming, and did not despair for the ancient faith, the Reformation in Scotland was inevitable, and no man could hinder its approach. For centuries the Church was moving slowly towards the fall which Beaton for a time impeded.

The reign of David I. marks the period of greatest activity in the growth of the Catholic Church in Scotland, and the paradox of evolution is shown in the fact that to that reign we must look for the chief cause of the Church's decline. In the ancient Scottish Church the bishops were wandering apostles. David, though not the first to be a patron of Christianity, was the most liberal of monarchs in founding bishoprics and endowing abbeys. Kings, nobles, and saints followed him in erecting religious houses, or in adding to the endowment of existing ones. Magnificent cathedrals and splendid abbeys were built over all the land, till no other country of Europe was richer in those edifices. Donors, as if contributing directly to the Lord, gave of their

lands and wealth; and the entrant about to take the monastic vows was expected to lay the price of his possessions at the feet of the successors of the apostles. The doctrine of purgatory was of inestimable financial value to the Church, for no one could afford to die without securing safety in the next world by the saying of masses in this; and pious children, remembering that their fathers had been sinners, gave for masses for the dead the gold which opened even the door of purgatory.

The saints to whom the various churches were dedicated showed an avaricious fondness for gifts before their intercession could be had for the quick and the dead. Every saint had his price. There was in Scotland no Louis VII. with his matchless jewel for the shrine of Becket; but the popular saints brought wealth to their altars, and thence to the treasuries of their priests.

Friars wandered about selling indulgences, charms, and holy relics, and one of these was the poet Dunbar, who afterwards made merry over the habits of his own order. Chaucer, with his genial satire, described the pardoner with his wallet full of pardons come from Rome; and Langland, with more of scorn,

pictured the pardoner cajoling the people to buy his wares. Everywhere in Europe, when the zeal of the various monkish orders was dead with their founders, the friars made themselves conspicuous by the violation of the vows which they had taken. Dante sang the praise of St Francis and his vow of poverty; but even Dante did not live too soon to bewail and satirise the avarice and worldliness of the followers of St Francis and St Dominic, and even of the representatives of St Peter himself.

Through the Canon Law, which embraced all things relating to "orphans, the wills of defuncts, the matters of marriage and divorce,"[1] the wealth of the Church was increased. Moreover, as the priest was the notary of those days, it is within the bounds of possibility that unscrupulous means were sometimes used through last wills and testaments to fill the clerical treasury.

Neither the amount of the ecclesiastical revenue nor the acreage of Church lands can now be determined. The return to the Privy Council immediately after the Reformation was not complete, and the value of what was paid in kind cannot now be computed. In regard

[1] Stair's Institutes.

to the land, however, it is not an extravagant estimate that at least one-half of the whole area of Scotland belonged to the Church. David was a "sore saint" indeed for his successors; and often donors to the Church laid up treasures in heaven to the worldly loss of their children, who had reason to grudge the excessive piety of their parents.

The aggrandisement of the Church was, however, wholly beneficial in more than one direction.

Religion was widely distributed and securely established in the country; and as the clergy were also guardians of education, and some of them engaged in the practice of law and medicine, the endowment of the Church was, for a time at least, an effective instrument in religious and social progress. The clergy, moreover, were the best agriculturists in the land.

In a military nation, where, as in Scotland, the spirit of nationality was roused only at the threat of conquest by the foreigner, but where clan was set against clan, it was fortunate for the cause of civilisation that there was a landowning class, men of peace by profession, to inherit and cultivate the earth. In France, in

the generation before the Revolution, the lands of the religious houses were the best tilled in the country; even at so late a time, the clergy of France thus preserved the ancient traditions of their orders, and showed what the monks had done for agriculture in the middle ages. When, however, we assert that the wealth of the Church drew the ablest men to her offices, we conclude the number of the benefits that flowed from the ecclesiastical endowments.

David I. and other patrons of piety, in gifting great wealth to the Church, made that wealth, in later days, the envied prey of greedy nobles; and as many of the benefices were of high value, they became at all times objects of ambition to many neither wise nor good. While able men of lowly origin often attained to high official position, and while from the highest social ranks were drawn men like Bishop Kennedy, who won golden opinions for their splendid ability, the clerical offices were but too frequently held by men more fitted for Parliament or for the army than for the priesthood. Buchanan, speaking of the reign of James I., declares that the livings in general either were bestowed upon the most

worthless members of noble families who were unfit for other employment, or were intercepted by the fraud of the Roman See; while Dunbar, in a poem to the king, complained—

> "I knaw nocht how the Kirk is gydit,
> Bot Benefices ar nocht leill devydit;
> Sum men hes sevin, and I nocht ane,
> Quhilk to considder is ane pane."

Sir David Lindsay, who hated the race of clerics, found an occasion to satirise the method of ecclesiastical patronage by asking for himself the appointment of master-tailor to the king. James was amazed at the request. "Sir," said Lindsay, "you have given bishoprics and benefices to mony standing here about you, and yet they can nouther teach nor preach: and why may not I as weill be your taylor, thocht I can nouther shape nor sew?"[1]

The sovereigns held in their own hand the nomination, under conditions, to vacant sees; the preferments were a splendid piece of patronage, and by Acts of Parliament in the days of the Stuart kings, it was distinctly declared that the nomination belonged to the king, and "the provision of the same to the Pope." In the see of St Andrews alone, from the year 1400

[1] Irving's Lives of the Scottish Poets.

to the time of the Reformation, there were at least six bishops of royal pedigree; Alexander Stewart, upon whom Erasmus bestowed his praise, the natural son of James IV., was Archbishop of St Andrews when at the age of twenty he fought and fell on the field of Flodden. James V. in virtue of his prerogative provided for his illegitimate sons, and for himself at the same time, by appointing them severally as abbots or priors of Holyrood, Kelso, Melrose, Coldingham, and St Andrews.[1]

There are several Acts of the Parliaments of James III. and James IV. against trafficking in Rome for Scottish benefices. Under one of these Acts, Gavin Douglas was imprisoned by his political enemies for a year, upon the charge of having obtained a Bull from the Pope appointing him to the bishopric of Dunkeld. In England under a similar statute of Richard II. Cardinal Wolsey was impeached. These Acts are proof not of an attempted reform of patronage, but of the desire of the monarchs to retain the patronage securely in their own hands; and they are proof also of the shameful traffic in benefices which followed from the opulence of the Scottish Church.

[1] Balfour's Annals, 1537. Hamilton Papers, I. No. 272.

By an Act passed in the reign of James III., to confirm one of the reign of Robert the Bruce, Englishmen were made ineligible for Scottish benefices, though in earlier times no restriction existed. English, Spanish, and Italian priests had been appointed to high offices. But before the Bull which erected St Andrews into a primate's see, the election of Englishmen—as that of Eadmer, a monk of Canterbury—to the bishopric of St Andrews, raised the question of the ecclesiastical dependence of Scotland on England. The Act which made an Englishman incapable of election, while it settled this vexed question, increased the value of the ecclesiastical monopoly, and made competition for the offices keener among the Scots. The demand for appointments not only led to the shameful traffic already noticed, but the unsettled order of election produced riot and anarchy, which debased the Church in the estimation of a people who have always loved at least the decencies of religion. After Flodden, when the see of St Andrews was vacant by the death of the youthful archbishop, and when the venerable Bishop Elphinstone, founder of the University of Aberdeen, had refused the nomination, a scene of lawless strife was enacted.

Andrew Forman, Bishop of Moray, was nominated by the Pope; John Hepburn, Prior of St Andrews, by the Chapter; and Gavin Douglas, her husband's uncle, by the queen-regent. Douglas seized the castle, but was ousted by the superior force of Hepburn. Eventually Forman, through the help of his purse, was installed, and Hepburn was bought off. Douglas afterwards was not more fortunate in obtaining a peaceable entrance into the bishopric of Dunkeld. He was nominated by the queen-regent; but Andrew Stewart, brother of the Earl of Athole, seized the castle, even though the nomination by the regent had been strengthened by a Bull from the Pope. When at last Douglas was consecrated, he could not be enthroned; the cathedral and the palace were both held in siege against the bishop's supporters, and peace was eventually secured only by purchasing Stewart's submission.[1]

One other method of ecclesiastical traffic recorded by Buchanan may be cited in evidence of the corruption of the Church.

Robert Cairncross, an aspirant to a holy office, in order to elude the law of Ambitus, as Calderwood says, wagered a large sum of

[1] Maitland's History of Scotland, p. 762.

money, which he deposited in the king's hands, that he, James V., would not present him with the first vacant benefice. The king won the wager by presenting him to the vacant abbey of Holyrood.[1] The story may well be believed, since this method of purchasing a living was not dead in the reign of George II., when a bet to Lady Yarmouth of £5000 gained a bishopric. Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, Henry's martyr, is a notable exception among the traffickers for livings who were native of every country of Christendom. He was appointed by Henry to the bishopric of Rochester, and in it he continued till his death. He used to say, so Burnet wrote, that his church was his wife, and he would never part with her because she was poor.

Major and Buchanan have each lamented the wealth of the Church, though Spottiswood, in a later time, has spoken a word in its favour. Most of us, however, while applauding the spread and establishment of religion by the bounty of pious donors, are likely to conclude that it would have conduced to the peace of the State, the purity of public patronage, the welfare of true religion, and the stability of

[1] Buchanan's History of Scotland, xiv. 35.

the Church, if the apostolic succession had been in the line of lowliness and poverty.

The wealth of the Church resulted not only in the evils attendant upon the traffic in livings, but also in the neglect of priestly work, and in idleness and profligacy. In the "Dance of the Seven Deadly Sins" Profligacy, less politely styled, is led in by Idleness. The pursuit of learning and the practice of priestly duties might have prevented these vices; but learning and literature, till the century before the Reformation, were found only among the few. From the twelfth century onwards certain towns like Perth and Stirling possessed, apart from the monastic seminaries, public schools taught by the clergy. James I., with praiseworthy zeal, tried to rouse the nation from its ignorant slumbers, and founded schools, and charged the clergy to see to their own education. But till the foundation of the University of St Andrews, scholars had to seek the higher learning in other lands. Probably Balliol College, Oxford, was intended for Scottish youths, as was also the Scots College in Paris; while Cambridge and Bologna also drew students from Scotland.

Before the end of the fifteenth century, when

the population could not have numbered more than a million, three universities existed in Scotland; and in a short time afterwards two of them possessed incorporated colleges. These universities and colleges were founded by the clergy, against whom our modern historians so often inveigh with unbridled licence. The universities flourished, especially the two northern ones; but it does not appear that the youths intended for the priesthood were, as a rule, encouraged to seek the universities, although the classes were taught by clerics, and the universities were superintended by high ecclesiastical dignitaries. The fact that the clerical students, as a rule, did not proceed to the universities, may account for the ignorance charged against the clergy of a country where there was no lack of universities. It will be found that men, afterwards of eminence, like Dunbar, who was a Franciscan, and David Beaton, who rose to the rank of cardinal, were originally students of one or other of the universities; but the ignorance of the Catholic clergy in the century of the Reformation cannot be explained if university attendance were required of clerical students.

In a letter by Alexander Myln, Abbot of

Cambuskenneth, light is shed on this subject, and yet the writer was not a favourer of the Reformed doctrines. The letter belongs to the year 1522, and in it Myln says to the Abbot of St Victor, near Paris, "We stand in need of nothing so much as of an accession of learned men. Although in former times men of learning abounded in our monastery, yet at present they are almost extinct, nor will their place be speedily supplied unless we send a certain number of our most promising novices to the universities, where there is a greater frequency of literary exercises. But we do not hold it expedient for them to engage in secular studies, and we therefore solicit that they should be educated in your college. . . ."[1] This letter helps to account for the ignorance of the clergy, though no greater historical blunder could be made than a sweeping charge of ignorance against the Church which produced chroniclers like Fordun, Bower, and Wyntoun; scholars like Boece and Lesley; poets like Barbour, Dunbar, and Douglas; ecclesiastics like Kennedy and Elphinstone. None the less, the scholarship and excellence of some of the higher clergy could not prevent the decline

[1] Irving's Lives, Introduction.

and hinder the final ruin of a Church whose priests were destitute as a class of higher learning, and had at best such scholarship as that displayed in the monkish legends and tales. The foundation of the universities was beyond doubt one of the chief causes of the Reformation; and yet these universities were founded and patronised by dignitaries of an institution which claimed spiritual authority over the individual conscience. Beaton himself, while trying to stem the rising tide of the Reformation, was patron of learning at St Andrews.[1] By the irony of fate, lovers of learning became the unconscious destroyers of an institution they loved with a stronger passion. Yet in the light spread from the universities there could not stand clerics like the bishop who claimed that he had "come on indifferently well" though he knew "neither the Old or New Testament."

In England in the fourteenth century Langland had written his "Vision"; and though Scotland had no poet of that period to lament the decay of religion, yet what Langland wrote of England was equally true of Scotland.

[1] The revenues of St Mary's College were augmented by him, and he was Chancellor of the University.

Wiclif perhaps was the original of Chaucer's "pore persoun," but among the clergy of the Pre-Reformation Church it is to be feared that we must look in vain for the good priest. The silence of Scottish history regarding such a priest is not a proof that he never existed; but if we take the parson of Chaucer's art as an ideal, we find none like him in recorded history. Bishop Lesley, himself an able and worthy prelate of the Roman Church, admits that no pains were taken to instruct the people in religion. Strange to relate in the history of a Church, in the indictment against Graham, first Archbishop of St Andrews, one of the charges was that he said three masses in the day;[1] and this triple sign of piety rose up in judgment against him.[2]

The secular or parochial priest seldom preached save at holiday times. At Lent especially, the preaching friars practised their art to rouse the people to zeal for some one or other of the distinctively Catholic virtues, such as confession or fasting. The character of dumb dogs, which Knox delights to ascribe

[1] Spottiswood, p. 59.

[2] Contrast Spottiswood's account of the indictment of Graham with that given in Gordon's Monasticon.

to the Catholic bishops, may well be applied to the whole clergy of Scotland before the Reformation. To ascribe this character to them would not, however, be justifiable merely because the Reformers delivered sermons inordinately long; but is justifiable because in the early Christian Church, and for many centuries in its history, the custom was to deliver sermons, and this custom was largely neglected in Scotland.

The quality of the sermons actually preached may be judged of in the light of Bonner's instruction to his clergy, "that there should be no sermons preached that had been made within these two hundred or three hundred years";[1] and we have no reason to think that the English priest was inferior to the Scottish. Barlow, afterwards Bishop of St Asaph, wrote to Cromwell in 1535 from Berwick, "For notwithstanding her be plentie of prestes, sondry sortes of religions, multytudes of monkes, flocking companys of freers, yet among them all so many, is ther not a fewe, noo not one, that sincerly preachithe Christ."[2]

In 1543, Arran, the governor, described the

[1] Burnet's Hist. of the Reformation, i. iii.
[2] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. p. 19.

clergy as having "bene sa consuetit in tymis bypast continuallye efter thair awin lustis and fleshly desyris that thai nevir exertit thaim to knaw the Word of God."[1] Arran, therefore, in order to instruct the people, and to make them understand the abuses of the Church, caused certain friars learned in the Scriptures to preach.

Among the causes of the decline of the Church, there is notably the immorality of the clergy. No one with the respect due to historic truth, or even to common-sense, would accept as strict veracities either the satires of poets anxious for artistic effect, or the descriptions of men or institutions made by their enemies. Wolsey's moral reputation is not to be sullied only because Shakspere makes the wit of Surrey merry over the Cardinal and "the brown wench." Luther's purity was assailed; his enemies could not afford to let him go free. Knox was, of course, defamed: he was guilty, in the imagination of his enemies, not only of the love which is illicit, but also of nightly communication with a visitor too black to be human. Protestants, therefore, to whom the reputation

[1] Hamilton Papers, i. 303.

of the Reformers is dear, may perhaps, in view of the slanders against their own heroes, allow for a percentage, to be fixed by their judgment and their charity, of exaggeration in the accounts of the immorality of notable Catholic prelates, and of the licentious habits of the whole clergy before the Reformation. Nevertheless, though charity thinketh no evil unless under irresistible conviction, the vice among the clergy of the Church before the Reformation is too glaring to be overlooked; and is proved, though its extent is not determined, by such documents as Cardinal Morton's letter to the Abbot of St Albans.[1] If Chaucer and Dunbar, to take certain of our own poets, could with impunity make clerics the heroes of tales written for the entertainment of the people, it may be taken as certain that the people, who did not resent the character given to the clergy of their Church, were familiar with the facts woven into the poet's art.

In England, Langland, who prophesied that a king would come to beat the clergy for breaking of their rule, but who never, even

[1] *Vide* Froude's History, and also his Short Studies. Conf. Registr. Episcop. Aberdon. (Maitland Club), Preface.

in dream, constructed a Reformed Church free from the domination of Rome, pictured the religious debasement of his country, and attributed it to the negligence of a worldly and licentious priesthood. Sir Thomas More, advocate of tolerance in his 'Utopia,' persecutor of the Protestants in London, opposed the withdrawal of England from allegiance to the Pope, but advocated the reform of the morals of the clergy; though in his reply to the once famous 'Supplication of the Beggars,' he defended the institution of the religious orders.

Erasmus, illustrious in his day in the whole world of letters, poured contempt and scorn on the race of monks, as he likened them to beetles; and even Rabelais, whose humour was not that for a Reformer, ground the monk through the mill of his satire. Probably the levellers of the Scottish religious houses did not know even the names of Langland, More, or Erasmus; but undoubtedly Patrick Hamilton, Wishart, Knox, and the other spiritual instruments of the Reformation, were alive to the influences which were moving in the world of letters.

In Scotland itself, Dunbar, though not inspired by the zeal of a Reformer, had prepared

the way in literature for Buchanan and Sir David Lindsay. Buchanan, ardent lover of liberty, and therefore keen Reformer and staunch republican, made by his Latin poem the name of Franciscan detestable, a name once honoured in the Christian Church; and if that poem was unintelligible to the people, its fame, and the flight of the poet consequent on its being written, drew the eyes of the people to the vices he had scourged. Lindsay, a violent hater of the clergy, used his poetical power to destroy their influence and lower still further their reputation.

Thus in the age before the Reformation the forces of literature were arrayed against the Church; and those forces, though not directly touching the people, moved men fitted by learning and spiritual power to be leaders. On the side of the Church there was no man of letters to be its advocate; though in the fifteenth century, Pecock, Bishop of Chichester, made a futile attempt by his 'Repressor' to justify certain practices which the Lollards condemned.[1]

In the enumeration of the causes of the de-

[1] Quentin Kennedy and Ninian Winzet belonged to the age of Knox.

cline of the Church, mention is to be made of the jealousy of the nobles against the prelates, who were almost the only men with education and learning adequate to the discharge of the duties of the high offices of the State. The prelates, consequently, who filled these offices, were brought into a close connection with the sovereigns; and the nobles, especially in the time of James V., ranged themselves as enemies to the churchmen, who filled the offices, guided the councils, enjoyed the wealth, but did not perform the military service, of the State.

To increase the jealousy of the nobles, members of the clerical orders were exempt from ordinary taxation, and were freed from subjection to the secular law of the land. First of the laws attributed by one of the Scottish chroniclers to Macbeth, is that in favour of the clergy: "He that is within orders of the Church shall not be compelled to answere before a temporall judge, but be remitted to his ordinaire."[1]

If to this jealousy be added a thieving rapacity, the force of English example, and the temptation to plunder inspired by the English

[1] Boece.

king, there will be found the motives which prompted the Scottish nobles, for the most part, to sanction the destruction of the religious houses, and to array themselves on the side of a reformed religion. To one man the ancient Scottish Church, an anachronism and an anomaly in days after Luther had sounded the note of religious revolution in Europe, owed its preservation throughout the period of Henry VIII.'s Scottish policy.

Beaton, who by his political genius towered above all his contemporaries, kept back for a generation the weak and corrupted Church from destruction; but his success in maintaining the Church was due neither to high personal worth, nor to the effective policy of persecution which he adopted, but to the fact that he was head of the national party which opposed Henry VIII. and his intrigues against Scottish independence. As head of the national party, he gathered around him men zealous for the safety of the ancient Church, and men alarmed for the welfare and independence of the country, and with this party he opposed with consummate skill and success the intrigues and policies of the English king. In saving the political liberties of his

country, Beaton saved for a time—although, as it turned out, only for a short time—the ancient Church, which was menaced by the man who, while he posed as the patron of the reformation of religion, was the arch-enemy of the freedom and independence of Scotland. But for Henry VIII. the Scottish Reformation might have been accomplished before the age of Knox, even though Beaton with legatine powers was reigning as head of the ancient Church.

CHAPTER II.

THE OLD ALLIANCE AND THE OLD ENMITY.

Throughout the period of Beaton's pre-eminence in ecclesiastical and political affairs which followed upon the death of James IV., Scotland was divided into a French and an English faction. France, with a view to her own interests elsewhere, was concerned to save Scotland from the English grasp, and had not only traditions of an old alliance, but the records of many treaties with Scotland, to go upon as a ground of intervention and of intrigue to this end. England's policy was governed by the avowed desire of a friendly union of the countries and by the actual lust of supremacy.

The history of the alliance between Scotland and France has won for M. Michel especially a high reputation for industrious research among

the "mouldy records" of treaties; while the history of the enmity between Scotland and England has called into the field of controversy a host of writers, energetic beyond doubt, but weighted, on this side as on that, with the burden of a national prejudice. Neither Scotsman nor Englishman can engage in this controversy without a bias for his country; but the foreigner will probably, like Dante, censure

> "The thirsting pride, that maketh fool alike
> The English and the Scot, impatient of their bound."

Where documents are few and judgment is warped by patriotism, historic certainty is hard to reach. Yet there are indisputable facts of the Scottish alliance with France, and of the enmity to England, which help to make intelligible Scotland's political history of the sixteenth century, and particularly of that period during which Beaton's influence was paramount.

The old Scottish historians, from Fordun to Buchanan, tell of a league negotiated in the year 790 between Charlemagne and Achaius, King of Scotland. We read that the league was entered into for the purpose of helping Charlemagne in his wars with the Saxons who inhabited Germany, and with those who, settled

in England, sailed thence as pirates to the coasts of Gaul. Further, we gather that the league was intended to secure for France a supply of learned Scots to act as professors in the College of Paris. Boece details the number of fighting men supplied to the French king; but Boece competes with Dempster for the position among Scottish historians of the father of lies. One writer has given the terms of the alliance; but he has invented them.[1] As we look at the figures of Charlemagne and Achaius on the canvas of European history, we are not inclined, without the strongest evidence, to believe that the French king had dealings with the king of the Scots. Such evidence as we have is derived from Eginhart,[2] the biographer and alleged son-in-law of Charlemagne, who affirms that the munificence of Charlemagne had the effect of making the kings of the Scots declare themselves the subjects and servants of France. Eginhart may be supposed to be an authority on this point; and if we cast aside the suspicion that his imagination chose Scotland as the western limit of the area of Charlemagne's treaties, which stretched eastward to the Persia of Haroun al Raschid, we may admit that in the

[1] *Vide* Maitland, p. 291. [2] Vita Car. Mag.

eighth century a connection of some now indefinable kind existed between Charlemagne and Achaius. It is of little historic moment, however, whether there was such a connection or not; seeing that if a league once existed, it did not endure as a political force affecting the progress either of France or Scotland. That which is of historic value is the fact that the tradition or legend of that connection has satisfied the pride of Scottish writers, who have rejoiced to point to one of their kings as worthy to enter into a treaty with Charlemagne, the hero of history and romance.[1]

In France, Mezeray has naturalised the story as found in Boece; and in many public documents of that country the old alliance is mentioned. In the contract of marriage between Francis and Mary, it was expressly stated that the friendship between the two kingdoms extended backward to the days of Charlemagne.[2] Whatever may have been the origin of this alliance, the friendship between the two countries was strengthened in later times by the cherished sentiment that it was of long endur-

[1] See the account of the alliance given in Hume's 'House of Douglas,' p. 5.

[2] Michel, Les Ecossais en France, ch. i.

ance; and this sentiment, moreover, helped to give stability to treaties which were matters of authentic history.

M. Michel speaks of several treaties of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries made between the kings of the two countries. In 1303, in a treaty between France and England, specific reference is made to the Scots as allies of the French; and from among the traditions and fictions which serve as the history of Wallace this fact has been recovered, that the Scottish hero had agents, and that he himself found refuge and help at the Court of Philip.[1] Rymer has preserved a treaty of the year 1326, which is valuable because it is the oldest on record of those entered into between France and Scotland, and also because it affords evidence that the two countries were then allied against England. In none, however, of the battles fought between Scotland and England, during the long feud which followed Bannockburn, did France join her arms to those of Scotland. But on her part, Scotland satisfied her natural hatred by making inroads on England's territory when the English armies were in France, or found

[1] Palgrave, Documents and Records illustrating the History of Scotland.

the delight of vengeance in sending soldiers to join the enemies of England. Though they suffered disaster and rout at Flodden and Solway, the Scots helped to drive the English out of France.

Portia's keen wit in the 'Merchant of Venice' describes the Scottish lord; and the picture is true to the life: "He borrowed a box of the ear of the Englishman, and swore he would pay him when he was able." "I think," says Portia, "the Frenchman became his surety, and sealed under for another." There can be no doubt of the readiness of the Scot to pay his debt when he was able.

In 1513, when Henry VIII. and Louis XII. were menacing each other, Scotland tried for her own sake, and for the sake of France, to gain the victory which might have been won at Flodden; but though France alone reaped the benefit from Flodden, through the weakening of Henry's forces, the friendship of the ancient allies was not impaired. At the end of the year 1524, when Beaton returned to his own country after six years' residence at the Court of Francis, Scotland was recovering from the shock of the great national disaster. Margaret Tudor had not been able, by persuasion

or kindly fraud, to prevent her husband from declaring war on her brother;[1] now, however, it was possible that Henry and his nephew James V., influenced by the feeling of kinship, might cement a peace, and put an end to the ancient alliance of Scotland and France. Such a peace was probable; but one cause which frustrated its accomplishment is found in the fact that the man who, during the second quarter of the sixteenth century, guided the policies of Scotland, had been resident in the French Court, where friendship for Scotland was genuine if not disinterested, and where enmity to England was unquestionably sincere.

Beaton entered upon his political work at home with sentiments of attachment to France, which had been the place of his education and the scene of his opening political career, and with feelings, to be strengthened by the gift of honours, in favour of the continuance of the ancient league. The hatred of the Scots against England was, according to Buchanan, fostered by prelates and priests in receipt of gold from France; but the Scot needed no priest to nourish his enmity against the Englishman.

[1] Compare the scene in Scott's 'Marmion.'

On the other hand, English Treasury Accounts show that the Scottish nobles who, in the time of Henry VIII., favoured an English alliance, were pensioners of the English king. Friendship with France and enmity to England were feelings common to all patriotic Scotsmen for generations before the Reformation; and those who cherished these feelings while working for their country's independence, are entitled to the praise or blame which is due to Nationalists. The memory of Beaton as a churchman has been held in bitter detestation, but as a politician he saved his country from falling under subjection to Henry; and though Henry now offered bribes, and now threatened his liberty and even his life, Beaton kept loyal to the national sentiment and true to the national policy of Scotland.

Henry VIII. succeeded to the throne young, ambitious, and impressed with an idea of his own genius. On the Continent there was still an arena for English armies; but for a final conquest and annexation of Scotland, armies were of no avail. Those armies might win battles and devastate a country never opulent; but the country which could support its own inhabitants would not even during one cam-

paign support the soldiers of England. Moreover, the Scots had excellent powers of self-recovery after defeat, and were soon ready again to harass their English foes. Henry knew that he might again and again defeat the Scots, but knew also that he could not subdue for ever, even by a succession of victories, the stubborn country which had Bannockburn for a heritage. His soldiers on more than one memorable occasion did find their way to Scotland; but Henry was anxious to establish England's overlordship by diplomacy and intrigue, rather than by war. The settlement of the Scottish question, which had been the dream of former kings, would be a triumph for his genius, and would free him from a dangerous auxiliary of France. Later in his reign this settlement became of pressing importance to him when, having failed to gain the election to the Empire, he turned his thoughts to the throne of France, and coveted a possession which the English kings had won and lost. Scotland and England were to be united in some way which would mean supremacy to England, and peace to her on her borders. This was Henry's policy, but it was by no means new.

Modern historians, who have an eye to England's glory, endeavour to prove the ancient submission to England of a Scotland which, geographically, did not exist in the days when certain kings are said to have given the tokens of this submission. Could it be shown that, in ages represented in legend and fiction and fact, kings in Scotland occasionally did homage to their more powerful English neighbours, there would still be wanting proof that Scotland, as now existing, ever rendered such homage. From the time when Picts and Scots are said to have been united, till the time of James VI., there is no sign to be found of a popular acquiescence in the English assertion of overlordship. Such an acquiescence could neither be made nor refused in the same fashion as it might be made or refused in the days of elected Parliaments; but although individual kings submitted themselves to the mastery of English sovereigns, the submission could not, and did not, bind the people of a country broken up into so many almost separate sections by clanship and by feudal distinctions. Nevertheless, to coerce Scotland into submission, to force it to acknowledge the English supremacy, was once the fondest hope of the kings of England;

and when Henry VIII. inherited the throne, he inherited this hope.

William the Lion, prisoner in the hands of Henry II., by the treaty of Falaise bartered his country's independence for his own liberty. Richard I. sold back to the Scots their independence for the price of ten thousand merks; but he stipulated that the Scottish kings should annually, if demanded, do homage in England for the lands which, as nobles, they held in that country. Edward I., by force and fraud, taking advantage of this arrangement as if it were the sign of Scotland's dependence, made himself overlord in the dispute for the Scottish crown, and gave that crown to one of the claimants for a price which has made the name of Baliol detested in Scotland. Wallace roused the spirit of patriotism among his countrymen, though there was no throne as a reward for his heroism. Bruce completed the work which Wallace had begun, and found for himself a kingdom. Bannockburn at last settled the question of Scottish freedom, even though Bruce's own son and the younger Baliol trafficked with the independence of a country which, kings though they were, was not in their keeping.

The civil wars of England doubtless prevented the stronger nation from crushing or exterminating the weaker, which would not submit. Henry VII., after the wars which carried him to the throne, found himself and his people desirous of peace, and was glad to enter into a treaty with James III.

By the marriage of James IV. to the daughter of Henry, the "Thrisil and the Rois" of Dunbar, the two countries were ultimately united: but though a perpetual peace was signed, the old hatred continued, and with tragic consequences. Flodden, in spite of this peace, was to be fought; and the Scottish people of to-day, proud of their history and proud of their songs, are no less touched by the pathos of the "Flowers of the Forest" than stirred by the trumpet-blast of "Scots wha hae." The pretext for James's declaration of war was threefold: Henry VIII.'s delay in giving up his sister's jewels, his negligence in avenging the death of Sir Robert Ker, and his refusal to give satisfaction for the murder of Andrew Barton. These were slight causes to bring about a war between two nations, but the temper of James was easily roused against a people which it was his prerogative as a Scot-

tish sovereign to hate : nor was he unwilling to respond to the demand of France, for the sake of the old alliance, to make war on England ; nor slow to listen to the chivalric call of the French queen, who named him her own knight in the quarrel.[1] Flodden, which might have been another Bannockburn, brought death to James, who deserved defeat for first dallying with "the evil woman" at Ford, and for thereafter taking to the field of battle the etiquette of a tournament or a duel ; but it also brought disaster on an army composed of the most illustrious of the land, too loyal to disobey their king, and too brave to abandon him.

James in his will had nominated the queen as regent in case of his death ; and though this was the first occasion on which a woman had been named to this office, the disaster of Flodden left few powerful or distinguished enough to dispute her title. At the meeting of Parliament in October of the year of Flodden arrangements were made for the coronation of the young king, and Margaret was recognised as regent. In November a French knight, La Bastie, among others, arrived with letters of credence from Louis XII., and from the Duke

[1] Compare 'Marmion.'

of Albany, who was now looked upon by many of the Scots as the person to fill the regency. Holinshed declares that a dispute took place among the Scots over the question of the vacancies caused by Flodden, and that some of the discontented Scots wrote secretly to Albany, asking him to take the government of their country. In the spring of the following year the queen bore a posthumous child, created by Parliament Duke of Ross. The Parliament which met in July continued Margaret in the regency; but nominated also, as a council to assist her, Archbishop James Beaton and the Lords Huntly, Angus, and Arran.[1] Albany doubtless agreed to this arrangement, as he himself was not in a position to proceed to Scotland on account of the French king's negotiations with Henry. Louis was anxious for peace with England, and Albany's regency, supplanting that of the king's sister, would have endangered the peace.

By the will of James, Margaret had been named regent only for so long as she remained a widow. She preferred a husband to the regency; and, while hardly recovered from her sickness, married Archibald Douglas, Earl of

[1] Letter of Margaret to Dacre, quoted by Pinkerton, ii. 120.

Angus. Immediately the country was divided into two parties, the one desirous of continuing the queen as regent and of establishing friendship with England, the other bent on maintaining the independence of the country and on inviting Albany from France. The anti-English party was victorious in Parliament, and the Duke of Albany, nephew of James III., French in all but descent and name, was brought from France and installed as regent, May 1515.

Before Albany's arrival Henry had been busy in Scottish affairs, endeavouring by allurements and bribes to establish his own supremacy. Margaret had been importuned to carry her son to England, and had been tempted by Henry's promise that he would declare his nephew heir-apparent to the English throne. Her husband's uncle, Gavin Douglas, had been offered on behalf of England honour upon honour, as the price of his aiding her flight. But Douglas had seen the danger attending Henry's proposals, and had refused to countenance them. Margaret could not flee to England like a peasant with her children, and so their scheme had failed.[1] On the other hand, through

[1] Correspondence quoted by Pinkerton, ii. 129.

Lord Dacre, warden of the English Borders, Henry had attempted all that could be attempted by bribery, and had been so successful that Dacre had four hundred Scots in his pay, ready to disturb the government about to be set up.[1] Thus Albany arrived to find a divided nation, though the party opposed to the English interest was the stronger of the two.

Outwardly there were friendly relations between Scotland and England. Louis XII. had made peace with Henry VIII., and this peace was confirmed by Francis I. on his accession. Scotland was specially named as a party in this treaty, though not till shortly before Albany's arrival was the assent of Scotland given. Albany, however, without intending to do so, played Henry's game when he mixed tyranny and revenge with his government of the Scots. Angus, Arran, Home, Lennox, Glencairn, were driven to espouse the English cause, and Margaret herself was fain to flee for protection to her brother. Henry, anxious that his armies might be free to carry out his Continental policies, urged again and again that a direct treaty of peace should be made between the

[1] Letter of Dacre to Wolsey; *vide* Ellis's Letters, first series.

two countries. At last, in June 1516, a brief peace was concluded; and on the day on which this truce was arranged, Henry sent to the Scottish Estates a letter in which he demanded the dismissal of the regent.[1] To this demand the Estates would not yield; but Albany, uncertain of his position, entered into negotiations with Wolsey, and promised to place the young king under the protection of the three Estates, to consent on his own behalf to a perpetual peace, and, at some future time, to visit England in order to confer with Henry. Secretly he entered into these negotiations, but publicly he sent to France to demand material help for his government, or, failing this help, permission to enable him to return to France. This help was refused, as, indeed, France was in no position to grant it. After various stratagems had been resorted to, Margaret was invited back to Scotland, that she might take charge of the young king; a council of regency was formed, which consisted of Forman, Archbishop of St Andrews, James Beaton, Archbishop of Glasgow and Chancellor of the kingdom, and the Earls of Angus, Argyle, Arran, Huntly. The council was divided between the French and English

[1] See the answer of the Scottish Parliament. Rymer, xiii.

interests; and leave of absence having been granted to him, the regent set sail for France, June 1517. These arrangements were, of course, within the knowledge of Henry, and it was further tacitly understood that during the regent's absence neither France nor England should directly interfere in Scottish affairs. For this tacit understanding there was some surety in the mixed character of the council.

In those days the political combinations of Europe were never constant. Henry having failed to secure for himself the election to the Imperial throne, turned again to the thought of recovering his French inheritance. Yielding to the persuasive words of his nephew Charles, who had been elected emperor, Henry transferred to him his alliance, so that each, doubly armed, might be able to fight his own battle. Francis, with the help of Wolsey, sought in vain to prevent this alliance; and though the political masquerade of the Field of the Cloth of Gold was acted, Francis was soon as anxious to set Scotland against her ancient enemy as, in the beginning of his reign, he had been at pains to maintain peace between them.

Margaret, meanwhile, was chafing under the

neglect of Henry and Wolsey. Henry had no money to spend on his sister, and Wolsey was husbanding his resources in order to pave a golden way to the Popedom. But Margaret wanted money more than the accomplishment of her brother's political schemes, and therefore she looked to France in her necessity. From her husband Angus, the leader of the English faction in Scottish affairs, she was now separated by the bitterest feelings of hatred; and so, angry with her brother, and hating her husband, she proposed that Albany should return to share with her the government of the country. Henry's alliance with the Emperor, and their hostilities against France, made this proposal acceptable to Francis; and accordingly, in November 1521, Albany landed in Scotland, where the French influence was once more dominant.

When this dual control, as the government carried on by Albany and Margaret may be called, was established, an attempt was made to crush the power of the Douglases. Angus was banished, and through the influence of Albany, Gavin Douglas was called to Rome.[1] In the year following the return of Albany,

[1] Buchanan, xiv. 13.

the Parliament decided to prepare for war with Henry, who was far from ready to meet the Scots. A magnificent army was collected; and though it is said to have numbered eighty thousand men, the regent disbanded it before an engagement took place. Historians have disputed as to the cause of the regent's conduct; but some reliance is to be placed on Buchanan's statement that the chiefs of the army, although willing to protect their own borders, refused to march into England merely to fight the battle of the French. Albany went back to France to make his peace with the king; while Margaret, veering round once more to the English interest, listened to her brother's proposal to marry the young king of Scotland to the Princess Mary of England. No effect, however, could be given to this proposal without the consent of the Estates; and of the Estates, the majority of the members were still favourable to the alliance with France. As if to complicate the political plot, Albany once more returned to Scotland, bringing with him a considerable number of French soldiers. These were to form part of a new army with which to attack the English, who during the regent's absence had been busy harassing the Scottish

borders in order to convince the Scots of the desirability of perpetual peace. An army was prepared, which is remembered now for having wasted its strength in the futile endeavour to capture Wark Castle. This failure was followed by months of inactivity; but at last the army was disbanded, whereupon Albany, plainly told by the Lords in Council that if he went he would not be allowed to return as regent, left for France. Albany departed, unhonoured by the country which he was incompetent to govern.

Henry was now free to compass his latest scheme, the "erection" of the young king, James V. James was in his thirteenth year, and was too young to govern, even though the Estates should recognise his rule. Henry, however, conceived that the "erection" of the king —the recognition of him by the Estates as their sovereign—would be the most effective check on the French influence, and the surest preventive against Albany's return. In the correspondence of the years 1523-24, the question of the "erection" was often mooted; and, as signal proof of Henry's anxiety for the accomplishment of his design, we have a letter from Wolsey to Norfolk, in which the Cardinal, in the king's name, offered "counsel, address,

money, men," to any one who would assist in carrying out the project.[1] The English policy was successful, and James was recognised as king, in an assemblage held at Edinburgh in August 1524. In November of this year, the "erection" was ratified by an Act of Parliament, and the regency declared to be at an end. James, a boy of twelve years of age, was not fitted to govern men. Margaret was the boy's nearest relative, and when beside him exercised the most powerful influence over him. She had been favourable to the "erection," and was at this part of the year attached to the English faction; and consequently the boy-king being but the reflex of the governor, Henry seemed at last to be installed in the management of Scottish affairs. Albany's incapacity was a blow to the influence of the French party; but its ablest man, Archbishop James Beaton, the subject of Wolsey's vainly directed flattery, and the dreaded obstacle in the way of his schemes, did not leave Henry to the peace and enjoyment of unopposed authority. The Archbishop would not give his consent to the "erection" of the young king, even though he himself, Primate of the Church

[1] State Papers (Henry VIII.), iv. p. 90.

and Chancellor of the kingdom, might have hoped for a large share of actual power. Wolsey therefore directed his policy and cunning against the Scottish Primate, and tried to induce him to proceed to England to arrange a settlement of Scottish affairs; and it is evident now from Wolsey's letters that he intended to keep the Archbishop a prisoner, could he only induce him to set foot in England. James Beaton, however, met cunning with cunning, and evidently suspected the purity of Wolsey's proposals.[1] To England he would not go; and seldom he left the security of his stronghold at St Andrews. When he did leave his castle to attend the meeting in Edinburgh in August 1524, he was seized and cast into prison through the devices of Wolsey,[2] because he had advised that the "erection" of the king should not take place till after September, the termination of Albany's leave of absence. His imprisonment was of short duration. Wolsey intrigued in order that Beaton might be sent a prisoner to England; but with the majority of the Scottish nobles, patriotism as yet was

[1] Correspondence quoted by Pinkerton, ii. 241.

[2] Buch., xiv. 24; Diurn. of Occur.; State Papers (Henry VIII., For. and Domestic), iii. ii. pp. 665, 766.

stronger than devotion to any foreign cause; and those nobles, often divided amongst themselves by almost unintelligible jealousies, and separated by envy from the opulent and fortunate churchmen, would not submit to the indignity of sending a Scotsman to an English prison.[1]

Albany departed to France in May of the year 1524; in August the "erection" of the king was accomplished in the assemblage at Edinburgh, and in November the "erection" was ratified by Parliament. At Christmas two galleys arrived at St Andrews from France, and brought certain Frenchmen to the castle of the Archbishop. The incident was full of suspicion to Magnus, the English resident, lately accredited to Scotland; and therefore he wrote to James Beaton seeking an explanation. Magnus was either a novice in the art of diplomacy, or knew nothing of the skilful politician to whom he was writing. The Archbishop assured him, in return, that the Frenchmen were strangers to him, and that he knew nothing of their coming till they "knokit at ye ȝet."[2] It was

[1] State Papers (Henry VIII.), iv. pp. 97, 121, 141, 146, 170, 209.

[2] Ibid., p. 282.

Christmas-time, and he was bound to entertain strangers. If Magnus was deceived by the simple cunning of the Archbishop, no modern reader of the English correspondence would be as credulous as the English resident. Beaton had opposed the "erection" of James; he had been the object of Henry's cajolements and attacks; he had even suffered imprisonment at the hands of the English faction. Shortly after his release from prison, a company of Frenchmen arrived at the Castle of St Andrews, and with them was the Archbishop's nephew, David Beaton, come from his residency in France; or, as is conjectured by Pinkerton and asserted by Froude, from a special mission to Francis in name of the queen, or of Arran, the chief noble among the Scottish adherents of France. The sequence of these events is written on an easily intelligible page of the book of Scottish history. The arrival of the French galleys is to be taken as the next movement of the French policy, after the success of Henry's scheme for the "erection" of James.

David Beaton's arrival on the scene of Scottish politics bears the appearance of mystery and intrigue which attaches to his subsequent

actions; but it is the event which gives certainty to the belief that his uncle, the Primate and Chancellor, was the main support of the French influence in Scotland. "The said Mr Davy," wrote Magnus, "albeit he were ambassador to the King of Scots in France, immediately after his coming to Dunbar, without either doing his duty to the king's grace here or to the queen's grace, departed from thence, and went straight to the Archbishop of St Andrews."[1]

[1] State Papers (Henry VIII.), iv. p. 277.

CHAPTER III.

EARLY INFLUENCES ON BEATON'S CHARACTER.

David Beaton, the future Cardinal, belonged to an ancient Scottish family, from which various officers of the State had been drawn. He was born in 1494, and was the seventh son of John Beaton or Bethune of Balfour, Fife, and of Isabel, daughter of David Monypenny of Pitmilly, of the same county.[1] Robert de Bethune, in the reign of Robert II., married the heiress of John de Balfour, by whom came the estate in Fife; but the name of Beaton has been rendered famous in Scottish history by the members of the family who were churchmen, and by the Mary Beaton who was one of the queen's "four Maries."[2]

[1] The spelling of the name is various—Betoune, Betone, Bethune, Beatton, Betun.

[2] For genealogy see Wood's 'East Neuk of Fife,' and Lodge's 'Portraits.'

By the marriage of the first Earl of Arran to the daughter of Sir David Beaton of Creich, the Cardinal was related to the Regent Arran, whose policies he at last so often skilfully manipulated.

As a rule, the great political churchmen outside of Italy, of the Wolsey and Mazarin class, have been men with whose pedigree history has no concern; and Beaton is no exception, save as regards his uncle, the Archbishop and Primate.

It has already been mentioned that James Beaton, then Archbishop of Glasgow, was one of the council of regency formed before Albany's first arrival in Scotland. In 1515 he was made Chancellor, and again was appointed one of the regents during Albany's absence.[1] In 1520 occurred the incident known in Scottish affairs as "Cleanse the Causeway," by which the Archbishop, while he almost lost his life, gained the addition to his name of "Clattering Conscience."

In 1522, James Beaton was translated from Glasgow to St Andrews,[2] in succession to Forman, who by his political intrigues contrived to gain rewards from the Pope and from the Kings of France and England.

[1] He was Chancellor in 1513, according to Brunton and Haig.
[2] Spottiswood, p. 62.

As Chancellor and Primate, James Beaton was the supreme power in Scotland for the short space of two months, immediately after Albany's final departure to France; but Henry's intrigues deposed him from political supremacy, and thus bound him more closely to the interests of France.

In official position, public policy, and private character, David Beaton was the direct successor of his uncle; but the men are distinguishable by the astuter and subtler genius brought by the nephew to political and ecclesiastical affairs.

Nothing is known of the childhood of David Beaton, or of his university career, save that he matriculated at St Andrews and Glasgow,[1] and afterwards passed to Paris, then a noted school of canon and civil law.[2] We have no stories of his infant precocity; and even his enemies have circulated no tales of juvenile cruelty, in which the boy is father to the man who burned heretics. If the malice of his opponents had invented episodes of mischief, the volume of his

[1] In the Munim. Glasg. there is record of a David Beton among the students of the year 1511.

[2] An interesting account of the universities of St Andrews and Paris during the first part of the sixteenth century is to be found in Lorimer's 'Patrick Hamilton.'

childhood and youth would not have been utterly blank. There is no evidence whether he distinguished himself in the scholastic exercises of the university, though Mackenzie declares that he was "well seen in all the parts of literature"; but Mackenzie romanced, and could not distinguish fact from fiction, nor truth from his own invention.

Dempster, in proof of Beaton's genius, makes him out to have been the author of three literary works: 'De legationibus suis,' 'De Primatu Petri,' and 'Epistolæ'; but except the letters, which were probably his ordinary correspondence, none of these writings has ever been discovered. One is safe to affirm that a chancellor of a kingdom and a cardinal of the Church wrote letters, though one may not venture to say that these letters are literature. Hay, the author of a panegyric on the Cardinal, praises his learning; but the author of a panegyric writes for the purpose of praising, rather than for the purpose of setting forth the truth.

On the whole, in spite of such expressions to the contrary, it is probable that Beaton did not carry the reputation of a scholar to the work of Church and State; though Jervise[1] asserts that

[1] Land of the Lindsays.

we owe to the Cardinal the preservation of some of the most valuable remains of our monastic literature, which he fortunately plucked from the flames kindled by infuriated zealots.

The parallel between Beaton and Wolsey, so often drawn by those who label Scottish men and places with English names, does not fail in respect of the literary and scholarly standing of the two cardinals, which in neither case was eminent, though each of them is numbered among the patrons of learning in the history of the university. Sir David Lindsay, in the Tragedy of the Cardinal, very plainly satirises Beaton's ignorance :—

> "Howbeit I was legate and cardinal,
> Little I knew therin what suld be done;
> I understood no science spiritual,
> No more than did Blind Allan of the moon."

Lindsay, however, was a Protestant.

Learning, as we have seen, scarcely existed in Scotland before the Reformation, though universities and colleges had been founded. There were not altogether wanting distinguished scholars, but, like George Buchanan, they were obliged to seek in other countries helps to the study of letters and to the acquirement of learning. Beaton, if not a master of

classical learning and of the philosophy of the scholastics, was at least not an exception to the multitude of his countrymen in those days. By the statute of James IV., of date 1496, the sons of gentlemen were required to attend school in order to learn Latin; but this statute indicated a liberal-minded king rather than an advanced scholarship in the schools. The translation of Virgil by Gavin Douglas belongs to the period of Beaton's youth, but affords no proof, excellent as the translation is, that the study of the ancient classics was pursued with scholarly accuracy and taste in Scotland before the Reformation. The scholastic philosophy reigned triumphant in the universities of Europe, and was the substitute for science and metaphysics; while theology, as distinguished from the scholastic philosophy, meant for the most part the writings and sayings of the Christian Fathers, and exercises thereon.[1] A knowledge of canon law was necessary to the efficient discharge of the duties attaching to the higher offices of the Church, and a knowledge of civil law was equally necessary for

[1] Thomas Aquinas may be taken as a representative scholastic and theologian of the middle ages. Aristotle in philosophy and the Fathers in theology were his guides. He is justly called *the* great Catholic doctor.

an officer of the State. The consistorial courts were ecclesiastical courts presided over by churchmen;[1] and in the law courts of Edinburgh, established by James V., churchmen were among the judges. Scotland, which thus required acquaintance with both the canon and the civil law on the part of those engaged in the management of public affairs, never had, before the Reformation, any notable teacher of either system, and hence students of law desirous of an adequate training passed from Scotland to Bologna or Paris. In the north of Italy, in the eleventh century, the study of the ancient Roman law was revived, and Bologna became the centre of this study. Subsequently Paris attained celebrity as a school of canon law; and though civil law, from the thirteenth century downwards, was prohibited by Papal decree among the regular subjects taught in the University, the Parliament of Paris made arrangements for lectures on this subject; and as men of note from other places were periodically appointed lecturers, the University gained high distinction as a school of civil law.[2]

The exact dates of Beaton's studentship at

[1] Conf. Fraser's 'Husband and Wife,' Introduction.
[2] See Tytler's Life of Sir Thomas Craig.

Paris are unknown; but before 1519 he had finished his studies in Paris and had returned to Scotland, since in that year he was appointed to the office of Scottish resident at the Court of France. When David Beaton returned from the University his uncle was closely allied with Albany, and was therefore in a position to advance the fortunes of his nephew. Doubtless the young man's French education, and signs of ability in political work which he probably displayed, rendered him gracious in Albany's eyes; but his connection with the Archbishop accounts most plausibly for the appointment of a man of twenty-five years of age as resident at a Court where the guardianship of Scottish interests required political experience and ability.[1]

The years of Beaton's stay in France are the years of his political apprenticeship, though he may have displayed a master's power in his work, which certainly demanded more than the skill of a novice. Nothing, however, is known regarding the incidents and details of his French career,[2] and we are left, therefore, to consider

[1] According to Lodge, Beaton, while a student in Paris, was sometimes employed in the diplomatic business of the Scottish regent.

[2] There is evidence that in the years 1522-23-24 he passed

not the labours of this political apprentice, but the scene of those labours.

Francis I. was king. He was young, gay, covetous of pleasures, fond of art, and ambitious of the signs and shows, the trappings and the suits, of kingly power. The dream of his early manhood had been to be emperor, and thus to be master of Christendom and the chosen champion against the Turks; and he willingly offered fortunes in purchase of votes for his election to the imperial throne, which, however, was won by Charles of Spain. After the victory of Marignano, Francis sought knighthood, in medieval fashion, from the hands of his bravest soldier, Bayard, around whose memory cluster tales and traditions as of an Arthurian legend. The victory of Marignano was hailed by Francis and his followers as a victory for chivalry, and till the defeat of Pavia in 1525 that victory shed a glory over the name of the king. The nobles of France rejoiced in the military glitter of their king, and in their eyes the early years of his reign blazed as with the splendour of the Field of the Cloth of Gold.

from Scotland to France on State business. State Papers (Henry VIII., For. and Domest.), iii. 2, and iv. 1.

But there is another aspect of those years of Francis's reign. The Court life reflected the gay, selfish, sensual character of the king. If any, even, of the stories of Beaton's profligacy throughout his career in Scotland are to be believed, the French Court may be pointed to as the nursery of his vices; just as in another generation the French Court received the censure of the moralists whom the reports as to the conduct of Mary of Scotland scandalised. In point of historical importance the licentiousness of the king was of small account compared with his policy in ecclesiastical affairs, which affected the liberties of France. Jubilant with the victory of Marignano, Francis proceeded to Bologna, and there in conference with the Pope, Leo X., endeavoured to secure the French interests in Italy. He had shown himself valiant in war, and felt therefore confident of success in council. But the king was a toy in the hands of the astute Pontiff. Leo agreed to the proposed terms of peace between France and the Papal power; yielded certain Papal claims to Italian territory, which claims could be set up again at any convenient season; and in return obtained from Francis an undertaking to abolish the Pragmatic Sanction of

Bourges. The Pragmatic Sanction was the charter of ecclesiastical autonomy in France, and, since its promulgation in 1438, had been the subject of strife between successive Popes and the kings of France. By its statutes decennial councils of the Church were ordained to be held; decrees of these councils were to bear authority above that of the Pope; annates and other sources of Papal revenue were abolished; and, which was of special consequence to France, the election to the high offices of the Church was to be placed in the hands of the Church. Francis and Leo agreed to a Concordat, which made havoc of these enactments of the Pragmatic Sanction. Leo secured for himself the annates, and on behalf of the Papal prerogative secured also the repeal of that superior authority which had been given to the decrees of the councils. Francis, on the other hand, gained for himself the right of Church patronage; and thus by the will of an autocrat the ecclesiastical liberty of France was destroyed, and, of vast importance to the king and his nobles, the power and independence of the clerical aristocracy were ruined.

It may seem an innocent and simple policy, this transference of patronage from the hands

of the Church to the hands of the king; but those were days when the patron reaped a harvest of gold, and when simony deepened the degradation of an institution already sunk far below the level of moral respectability. Francis found it no easy task to impose the Concordat on the Church: the Parliament would not at first publish it, nor would the University. Tyrants and autocrats have a barbarous but effective method of force which they seldom hesitate to employ in carrying out their policies; and Parliament and University suffered alike at the hands of the king, who stripped the Parliament of its control of ecclesiastical affairs, and destroyed the efficiency of the University by persecuting its most noted and courageous members.[1] The Church itself suffered dishonour; its offices were sold to the highest bidders, or were bestowed on favourites of the king. One consequence of the Concordat is seen in the rise of those political churchmen, of whom Richelieu was the ablest and of whom he is the type.

The struggle of the Concordat continued throughout the years of Beaton's stay in

[1] A full account of this affair is to be found in Burnet, 'Hist. of Reform.,' Part III.

France, and was too momentous in its force and results to leave no impress on his character. Once more we are without recorded syllable to tell us of the side on which Beaton's sympathies were ranged. Were we to judge by his own subsequent policies in Scottish ecclesiastical affairs, when Henry tempted the king of the Scots to lay his hand on the patrimony of the Church, we should suppose that his sympathies lay with the French Church when its liberties were infringed; but, on the other hand, were we to judge by his friendship with Francis, who afterwards bestowed on him a bishopric, and with Leo's successor, from whom he received the cardinal's hat, we should infer that his sympathies were with the king and the Pope.

In his position as Scottish resident, Beaton was not called upon to take a side in the dispute; and not being constrained to reveal his leanings, he was too astute and too subtle a diplomatist, as subsequent events in Scotland showed, to declare himself a partisan. In politics he who hesitates is lost, and deserves his fate; but Beaton, we are safe to conclude, was not hesitant, but only reticent from motives of worldly wisdom. The question of the Concordat

was one that primarily concerned the French nation, and did not directly affect the interests of Scotland. It produced in France a great constitutional struggle, in which the Church's prerogative was infringed and civil liberties were curtailed; and the French capital during the years of the struggle was a school of politics for a man like Beaton, who, in after-years and other places, was to be a leading actor in the scenes of a political and ecclesiastical drama.

It has been shown how, shortly after the "erection" of James V., Beaton returned from France, and went with certain Frenchmen direct to the Castle of St Andrews, without first presenting himself at the Scottish Court. From this circumstance we are entitled to argue that, in the judgment of Archbishop James Beaton and of Francis, David Beaton's presence in Scotland was required in the councils of those who opposed themselves to the intrigues of Henry in Scotland.

Beaton's first preferments were to the Rectories of Campsie and Cambuslang, and to the Chancellorship of Glasgow Cathedral. In the year 1523 his uncle resigned to him the Abbey of Arbroath, though retaining for his own use

a large share of the emoluments. The Pope was petitioned to grant a dispensation for two years to the new abbot not to wear the monachal habit. According to the customs of the Church at that period, an official, as high even as the abbot of one of the wealthiest abbeys, did not need to be in full orders when he enjoyed the dignity and the wealth of a clerical benefice. The Pope was able, as autocrat of the Church, to overrule the common ecclesiastical law; and no Pope was likely to interfere with a family arrangement of so faithful a son of the Church as the Primate of Scotland.[1]

In the official communication with regard to the nomination to Arbroath, Beaton is styled "Clericus Sancti Andreæ Diocesis," Protonotary of St Andrews, and Chancellor of the Church of Glasgow; and is also spoken of as the counsellor and friend of the king. In a letter to the Cardinal Sancti Eusebii, the Archbishop, after reference to the affair of the abbey, speaks of certain negotiations for the establishment of the primacy of the see of St Andrews over that of Glasgow, and announces the appointment of his nephew as ambassador to the Pope and the College of Cardinals. In a letter to the same

[1] Epp. Reg. Scot., i. pp. 339-341.

cardinal, sent in the name of James V., Beaton is appointed ambassador to the Pope and cardinals; and the king requests that Beaton alone should be heard as ambassador in regard to Scottish affairs. Nothing is known of the details of this mission to Rome, but we learn from a subsequent correspondence between Magnus and Wolsey that the question of the primacy was not settled in this year;[1] and Beaton himself, in later times, was a party, according to Knox, in a strife for precedence in the cathedral of Glasgow. That cathedral, by a Bull of Pope Alexander III., was freed from dependence on any bishop save its own and the Pope. When the see of Glasgow was made archiepiscopal in 1494,[2] the question of the supremacy of St Andrews arose; and if Knox's story be true, the question of supremacy remained unsettled when Beaton as cardinal visited the cathedral of Glasgow. The Cardinal and the Archbishop could not agree as to precedence. Beaton as cardinal, legate, and primate, maintained that his cross should be carried in front of the procession through the cathedral; the Archbishop, holding himself

[1] State Papers (Henry VIII.), iv. p. 429.
[2] Maitland, p. 246.

master in his own diocese and cathedral church, would yield to no one. A riot ensued, which Knox describes as a merry game, in which "Rockets were rent, Tippets were torn, and Crowns were knapped."[1]

The Abbey of Arbroath, or Aberbrothock, in Angus, was founded by William the Lion, and was dedicated to the memory of Thomas Becket. Pope Benedict granted to a certain abbot and his successors the right to wear the mitre, rings, robes, and other pontifical ornaments; and hence the social and ecclesiastical position of the abbot of Arbroath was one of the most dignified in the land.

In the year 1561 the revenues of the abbey, as entered in the "Book of Assumption of Thirds," amounted to £2873, 14s. Scots money, to which were added wheat, meal, and other things paid in kind.[2] These revenues meant very considerable wealth, calculated at £10,000 of our money, and were ample, after meeting the charges for the monks, to maintain the dignity of the abbot.

In the Register of the abbey Beaton's name first appears in January 18, 1524, as confirming Robert Scott's endowment of the altar of

[1] Knox, Bk. i. [2] Hay's History of Arbroath.

St Dupthacus; and in 1525 Beaton took his seat in the Scottish Parliament as abbot of Arbroath. It is evident, from the chartulary,[1] that the abbot attended to the business intrusted to him, since, on one occasion, he rebuked the officers for letting the convent want provisions—"Sen God, of His grace, has given the place largely to live upon."

This Register[2] records a name which one does not in these days associate with a house of God. On the 22d of May 1528, the abbot, for certain sums of money, "and other causes," granted to Mariote Ogylwy the liferent of the lease of the lands of Burnton of Ethie, and other lands near that place.[3] There are also notices of other lands having been granted on similar terms to this "Maistres Marion Ogilbye," as she is sometimes styled. This Mistress Marion, supposed to have been the daughter of Sir James Ogilvy, afterwards Lord Ogilvy of Airlie,[4] is characteristically described by one writer as Beaton's "chief lewd." In the later years of the Cardinal's life she resided at Melgund Castle, Forfarshire, which was built

[1] Registr. Nigr. de Aberbroth., p. 264.
[2] P. 482. [3] Ibid., pp. 500, 519, 521.
[4] Douglas's Peerage, Account of the Lords Airlie.

by Beaton, who acquired the estate in 1542. The initials of Beaton and of the lady are still to be seen on parts of the ruins of the castle.

Marion Ogilvy's claim to the distinction of "chief lewd" may have been well founded; though Protestant zeal has given to the Cardinal a reputation for immorality, evil beyond that of his fellow-dignitaries. Chambers, in a 'Picture of Scotland,' asserts that Beaton had six illegitimate daughters, besides sons, and that these children were almost all born of different mothers. This assertion is made without further proof than that furnished by tradition. It is beyond doubt, however, that Marion Ogilvy bore Beaton several children. It has been alleged by apologists for the Cardinal that he was married in some sort of morganatic union to Marion Ogilvy before he took priest's orders,[1] and that, when he became a priest, he lowered her status from that of a wife to that of a mistress. Cranmer was married before he was appointed to the archbishopric of Canterbury; and kept his wife, though he was a priest and an archbishop. Cardinal Mazarin[2] is said, with some author-

[1] Comp. Archæologia, xxxiv. p. 35.

[2] See Kitchin's Hist. of France, iii. p. 89.

ity, to have married Ann of Austria, the widow of Louis XIII.; but Mazarin, though a cardinal, was only in deacon's orders. Beaton, while in deacon's orders, may have married Marion Ogilvy; but it is highly improbable, since he was destined to the profession of the Church, and his marriage might have proved fatal to his entrance to the priesthood, even with the ready help of the Bishop of Rome. There is absolutely no proof of the alleged marriage, and in all the legal documents his children are said to be natural or illegitimate. During Beaton's lifetime three of his sons were legitimated by special Act of Parliament; and in the Act they are called his natural sons.[1] One of these sons, Alexander, entered the Church, was made Official of Lothian, and afterwards became a Protestant. The fact that the children were reputed illegitimate is no proof, however, that their father was not married: had he been married before he took full orders, and had he continued in wedlock after he became a priest, his children could not have been acknowledged legitimate.

Beaton was by no means singular as a priest

[1] Keith's Bishops.

in vowing celibacy, and in afterwards entering into or continuing unhallowed domestic ties; and the moralist finds ample material in the records of that time for grieving over vows of purity and celibacy made by men on the threshold of a priestly life, afterwards profaned by profligacy and lust. Be the stories of Beaton's indiscriminate immoralities true or not, he seems to have been attached to Marion Ogilvy as if she had been his wife; and, according to Knox, was in her company on the night preceding the day of his death.

David, eighth Earl of Crawford, was married in 1546 to Beaton's daughter. In the contract of marriage the Cardinal called the bride his daughter, and gave her 4000 merks as a dowry, at that date the largest ever given in Scotland to a bride. In the contract of marriage there is no mention of the mother's name, but Buchanan calls the bride the eldest daughter of the Cardinal, and there is every reason to believe that her mother was Marion Ogilvy.[1] Knox maintains that the marriage was celebrated at the expense of the Cardinal, as if the bride had been the daughter of a prince;

[1] Compare Douglas's Peerage, and Jervise's Land of the Lindsays.

but whether this was so or not, a marriage of the kind was not viewed with the favour which the moral ideas of those days might have sanctioned. Commissary Maule relates that Thomas Maule, younger of Panmure, an attendant on the Cardinal, was contracted in marriage to Beaton's daughter; but that James V. bade him "marry never ane priestes gett, . . . whereupon that marriage did cease."[1] The Cardinal resented the slight, and Maule was forced to pay 3000 merks. Beaton's private life undoubtedly was stained with the vice which so often rendered illustrious churchmen notorious examples of broken vows of chastity. Among the minor causes of the Reformation, next to the cupidity of the churchmen, must be reckoned the profligacy of the clergy pledged to celibacy; and without question a typical churchman of the pre-Reformation days is seen in the man who gained the highest honours and offices of the Church in Scotland, and who granted a liferent of abbey lands to the woman who was the mother of his illegitimate children.

[1] MS. Account of Panmure family, quoted in Gordon's 'Monasticon.'

CHAPTER IV.

BEATON AND PATRICK HAMILTON.

The years which followed Albany's regency saw the ascendency of Angus in Scottish affairs. The whole period of that ascendency was filled with political intrigues; the changes of parties and factions were like the changes of the kaleidoscope. What part David Beaton took in the political scenes is not recorded; but it may be accepted as certain that he followed, or perhaps dictated, the policies of his uncle. It is true that "ordinary history is like the face of a clock; we see the hands that move and that mark the time, but not the wheels and secret springs whereby it goes." The Archbishop of St Andrews was the wealthiest man in the country, the ablest diplomatist, the man of largest political experience; and his actions and policies do not require the explanation that

David Beaton inspired and directed them. Yet the Archbishop was growing old, and his nephew was young; and, closely associated as they were, it was not possible for the younger and abler man to be a mere spectator of events.

The ambassadors who arrived from France in 1524 informed the Archbishop that their king could not assist the Scots, and that Albany could not return to the regency.[1]

In the following year, 1525, the defeat of Pavia made the French king a prisoner, and proved his inferiority to the Emperor. The queen-regent of France and her councillors did not, however, leave Henry undisturbed in his Scottish policy. They sent an ambassador to Scotland to urge the continuance of the treaty of Rouen; and instructed him to assure the Archbishop of the queen's help in gaining the cardinal's hat for him, and to promise a bishopric or an abbacy in France for his nephew.[2] Before the battle of Pavia, Henry was still eager to outwit the French in Scotland; yet though he had spent money in subsidising Margaret, Arran, and Lennox, he had good reason to doubt the

[1] Letter of Francis. Conf. Pinkerton, ii. 244.

[2] Teulet, Relations Politiques de la France avec l'Ecosse, i. p. 57.

constancy of Margaret and Arran. The return of Angus had long been threatened as a check on the queen, who hated her husband with the hatred of a slighted woman. She remonstrated against the return of her husband, and in this was joined by Arran, who being, after Albany, the next heir to the crown, wished to be first in the councils of his country. The nobles, however, who were in Henry's pay, and who enjoyed no offices under the boy-king, looked to the return of Angus as a possible means of aggrandisement for themselves, and, at any rate, as a political change which might be of advantage to them. Margaret's remonstrances were in vain, as she did not support them with the signs of unquestionable fidelity to Henry's cause. Wolsey, accordingly, when he learned that Margaret and Arran were not prepared to be the passive instruments of his Scottish policy, withdrew the prohibition which barred the return of Angus. The release of the Archbishop of St Andrews in the autumn of 1524, after a short imprisonment, showed Wolsey that the queen and Arran would not accept their orders from his hands, and showed him also that the leaders of the French faction, despairing of Albany's return, might coalesce with the friends

of the queen and form a party opposed to the English interest. Angus might be relied upon as a tool for Henry, as long as the hatred of the queen against her husband continued; and that hatred was not likely to cease, since Margaret was solicitous of a divorce. Angus, in pursuance of the English policy, was permitted to return to Scotland in November 1524, after many promises to his master, the English king; but for a time his presence produced no effect on the political movements of the country. Wolsey had feared a coalition between the Archbishop and the party of the queen. The Archbishop, however, was deeply incensed over his imprisonment; and, whatever the queen and Arran may have expected, acted not out of gratitude for his release, but out of anger on account of his imprisonment. Unexpectedly he joined himself to Angus, and was thus the means of forming a national party to support neither England nor France, but to oppose Margaret and Arran. Buchanan declares that Angus, Lennox, and Argyle crossed the Forth and constrained Beaton to join them, and that he durst not refuse.[1] These nobles were about to attack the castle of Edinburgh, where Mar-

[1] Hist., xiv. 25.

garet held the king; and as the Archbishop was also Chancellor of the kingdom, his presence with them would be of the greatest significance.

Buchanan evidently was unable to explain the apparently sudden change of policy on the Chancellor's part on any other supposition than that of constraint and force; but Magnus, the English ambassador, described, on the other hand, the Chancellor as given "at all times above all other to the pleasure of the king's highness and his grace."[1]

By the coalition, the Archbishop was enabled to put himself in direct opposition to Margaret and Arran; while Angus was enabled to strengthen himself against the party of his wife, and also against the dictations of Wolsey.

Elated by this coalition, before he perceived the measure of independence which it secured to Angus, Wolsey promised that the Chancellor would be appointed the Pope's legate in Scotland, and would have a control over the abbacies in Scotland, such as Wolsey himself had in England; but although Beaton desired to meet the English ambassador at Dunfermline, and showed other signs of friendliness, the church-

[1] State Papers (Henry VIII.), iv. p. 443.

man who had previously refused the bribe of a cardinal's hat on the promise of Wolsey, and the politician whom Wolsey tried to entrap in England, was little likely to be thus easily brought over to the English interest.

At this period a friendly correspondence of considerable amount was carried on between the two prelates; but Beaton was a master of intrigue, and was astute enough to match Wolsey in diplomacy. The Archbishop's policy was not to further the cause of Henry, but to govern Scotland; and accordingly he joined himself to Angus, who speedily showed what military force could do to advance the fortunes of him who had it at command.

In February 1525, a Parliament was held in Edinburgh. In the procession Angus bore the crown, and Arran the sceptre. A council was chosen to govern the king and the realm, and among the members of that council were Beaton, Angus, and Arran.[1] Later in the same year, dissensions broke out in the council. The Archbishop had procured letters from the king to the Pope recommending his promotion to the rank of cardinal,[2] and Angus and Arran, for the

[1] Crawford's Officers of State; Leslie.

[2] Comp. State Papers (Henry VIII.), iv. p. 443.

present united in policy, showed their resentment at the aspirations of the Archbishop. It is plain that what these nobles really feared was the ascendency of the churchman in political matters, as the dignity of cardinal conferred on a pure churchman could not have affected them.

In the month of October, ambassadors went to England to arrange a truce for two years with Henry, who had joined in a treaty with Francis, after Pavia had established the ascendency of Charles V. This truce with England sent Arran back to Margaret; and he and Margaret were determined to prevent its ratification.[1] The queen had now broken off altogether from her brother; and Arran, though he had received his share of English gold, had never been on friendly terms with Henry, and had never been trusted by him. To prevent the ratification of the truce, Margaret and Arran got together an army; but the army quickly scattered when the young king with Angus, Argyle, and Lennox appeared against it.

Angus in the meantime acted as warden of the Scottish marches, while the Archbishop directed the business of the council of State. Whatever may have been his secret motive, the Archbishop

[1] State Papers (Henry VIII.), iv. p. 430.

publicly showed friendliness to England. In March of 1526, Magnus wrote to Wolsey that Beaton was the most powerful man in Scotland, and was now the chief friend of England, and advised that Wolsey should endeavour to obtain for the Scottish prelate the cardinal's hat and the legateship.[1] This Wolsey would not do, or did not do, as he knew not how to reward, but only how to use promises as bribes. In Beaton's desire for these priestly honours, we probably see the origin of his avowed friendship for England. Without Wolsey's help or the aid of France, the primate of Scotland could not hope for the red hat. France had failed the Archbishop, but England might serve instead. The English cardinal, however, while he might try to bribe the Scottish chancellor with the promise of the Pope's reward, was no doubt clear-sighted enough to see that if Beaton, already the most powerful man in Scotland, added to his honours the dignity of cardinal and Papal legate, he would govern Scotland at his pleasure, with unfortunate effect as against England. The Archbishop never received the red hat, nor did he ever attain to the dignity and authority of a legate of the Pope.

[1] State Papers (Henry VIII.), iv. p. 444.

In March of 1526 Margaret procured a divorce from her husband, and immediately afterwards married her lover, Henry Stewart. Once more Arran forsook the cause of the queen.[1] Ashamed of her indecent conduct, he attached himself to Angus and the Chancellor. Angus gladly welcomed him, since a union of the two most powerful nobles of the land would weaken the authority of the Chancellor, and since Arran, moreover, was a much less dangerous rival than Beaton. By this time, such was the military power of Angus, the young king was practically held prisoner by him; and to have possession of the king was to have the symbols and also the reality of power. On the 13th of June 1526, it was declared that the king was no longer a minor, and that henceforth the royal prerogative was to be in his own hands.[2] The statute which ordained the secret council, of which the Archbishop was the head, was annulled. These changes were made by Parliament, but when the king was declared to be no longer a minor he was in the custody of Angus; and now Angus was strengthened by the adhesion of Arran.

[1] State Papers (Henry VIII.), iv. pp. 385, 490.
[2] Acts of the Parliament of Scotland.

In July of 1526 an attempt was made by Scott of Buccleuch to rescue the king from the hands of his powerful servant. Angus, however, easily scattered the forces brought against him; and as Scott was a follower of Lennox, suspicion quickly fell upon Lennox, who was forced to retire from the Court.[1]

Margaret, the Chancellor, and Lennox were now united against Angus, and, with a view to deliver the king, they prepared an army. According to Lindsay of Pitscottie, the king, on Beaton's advice, made direct request to Lennox to rescue him; while Buchanan asserts that Lennox held a meeting at Stirling, where he made known his war policy, and that Beaton was among those who attended. Thus a stand was openly made against Angus; but Angus was too powerful to be overthrown by such enemies. In the fray Lennox himself was killed; and the pathetic picture of Arran spreading his scarlet cloak over the dead body of Lennox, is made all the more pathetic by Arran's words as quoted by Lindsay: "The wisest, the stoutest man, the hardiest man that ever was born in Scotland, has fallen this day."

[1] Buchanan, xiv. 27.

Angus was now master of Scotland, and was bent on seizing the queen and the Chancellor. He laid waste the castle of St Andrews, but did not find him whom he sought. The story is that Beaton, to escape capture, lurked about the mountains in the clothes of a shepherd.[1]

Lennox was dead; Arran, old and worn by the death of Lennox, who was his nephew, left the Court. Before he left, Beaton made his peace with him by giving him the revenues of the abbey of Kilwinning. Beaton also made his peace with Angus, by presenting him with two thousand merks, but did not by this means induce Angus to admit him to a share in the Government.[2] In the Parliament of May 1527, Angus himself held the seals of the Chancellor.[3] At the end, however, of this year, which had seen so many political changes, Angus and Beaton were once more reconciled; and at Christmas-time the royal table at St Andrews found places for Margaret, Beaton, and Angus.[4]

In the spring of the following year the dull routine of ecclesiastical affairs was broken by the martyrdom of Patrick Hamilton. Arch-

[1] Lindsay of Pitscottie; Buchanan.
[2] Lindsay.
[3] Crawford's Officers of State.
[4] Letter of Magnus to Wolsey, quoted by Pinkerton, ii. 288.

bishop James Beaton was a politician rather than a churchman, a worldling rather than a religious zealot, and hence the wonder often expressed that in his name Patrick Hamilton should have been summoned to St Andrews. Buchanan represents the Archbishop as, at a later time, brought to Court an infirm old man to weep over the ancient religion. Knox declares that the Archbishop was more careful of the world than he was to preach Christ, or yet to advance any religion; but further characterises him as one that "bare impatiently that any trouble should be made to the kingdom of darkness, whereof within this realm he was the head." Spottiswood, however, places the Archbishop in a different light, and asserts "that he himself was neither violently set, nor much solicitous (as it was thought) how matters went in the Church."

Though Patrick Hamilton was the "protomartyr of Scotland," he was not the initiator of the Scottish Reformation; he was simply one of the many Scottish disciples of the German Reformer. In a Parliament of 1525 it was enacted that the books of Luther should not be brought into Scotland by merchants or for-

eigners in their ships; punishment was threatened against such as conveyed those books from Germany, and against such as professed the doctrine of the books.[1] It is evident from this Act that the works of Luther were known in Scotland, and that the principles of the Reformation had made progress in the country. The clergy, no doubt, were the framers of the Act; but during James Beaton's administration there was no martyr till Patrick Hamilton, though the Reformation in Germany was now an accomplished fact. It is easy to understand that in the troubled times of the Archbishop's greatest authority in the State, while he attended to practical politics, he had few opportunities of shedding the blood of the martyrs, even had he been so disposed. Yet in view of the fact that while he was head of the council of the king, and Lutheran principles were establishing themselves in Scotland, he did nothing to arrest the spread of those principles, it is reasonable to conclude that the Archbishop, in inaugurating an aggressive policy against heresy, adopted the counsels of the younger man, who was soon to

[1] Robertson's Records of Scotland.

show himself a subtler statesman, a greater ecclesiastic, and a fiercer "persecutor of the saints." [1]

A few months before the martyrdom of Patrick Hamilton, the Archbishop himself was wandering about as if he were an escaped convict or a hunted martyr, and after his wandering had been glad to make his peace on money terms with Arran, the chief of the Hamiltons. It is not likely, therefore, that for the sake of the religion of which he was no ardent professor, or for the sake of the Church of which he had not proved himself a zealous partisan, except in the matter of the primacy of St Andrews over Glasgow, he would have risked personal discomfort and probably direct attack from the hands of Arran. Neither for religion nor for the Church would the Archbishop have endangered his personal comfort; and his new heroic policy against heresy is intelligible only on the theory that David Beaton was the instigator and the Archbishop the nominal agent of this policy. No prelate, however, armed only with the authority of the

[1] Alesius declares that the Archbishop desired Hamilton, before the trial, to flee from St Andrews.—*Vide* Lorimer's 'Patrick Hamilton,' ch. viii.

Church, could have attacked a member of a house so powerful as that of the Hamiltons. Not even David Beaton in the height of his power would have ventured alone to provoke the certain enmity and revenge of one of the greatest of the Scottish nobles. Undoubtedly Patrick Hamilton in his day was the most noted and most zealous of the Scottish disciples of Luther; and the surface explanation of his martyrdom is that he, being the most prominent heretic, was the victim readiest to the hand of the priest.

This explanation, however, does not suffice, since we find that in a later day the clergy were impotent to silence men like Sir David Lindsay, who were protected by the friendship of the king. Without the strongest political support, a support stronger than that of Arran, the Archbishop or his nephew could not have seized and condemned one of even the least of the Hamiltons. At this time the king was absent on a pilgrimage to a northern shrine, —a journey evidently arranged or sanctioned by Angus, lest solicitation might be made to James to save Hamilton, who was his own relative. Angus and Arran, moreover, though sometimes associated through the vicissitudes of

political intrigue, were never personal friends;[1] Arran, too, had incurred the wrath of Angus by opposing his return to Scotland, and now on the death of Lennox he had left the Court. There is reason, therefore, to believe that Angus, now chief in the State, and anxious to establish his authority, was willing to let it be seen that his most dangerous rival was not powerful enough to protect that rival's own kinsman. But for Angus, the Hamiltons could not have been injured as they were through the striking down of one of their blood and name; but it suited Angus to inflict the blow. Hence the death of the "proto-martyr of Scotland" is to be traced to political convenience as well as to priestly zeal—to the ambition of Angus as well as to the intolerance of one or other of the Beatons.[2]

The charge made against Hamilton was, of course, one simply of heresy, and as such it is to be examined. Patrick Hamilton, though popularly called the proto-martyr of Scotland,

[1] Wolsey, in a letter to Norfolk, 1524, wrote, "It shalbe founde a thing right difficile to make a good concorde bitwene thErles of Arayn and Angwishe, considering that thErle of Angwishe slewe Sir Patrike Hamelton," &c. — State Papers (Henry VIII.), iv. p. 106.

[2] Conf. Drummond's Hist. of James V.

was not the first in the country to suffer death for religion's sake. In the days of James I., John Resby, an English priest, and probably a follower of Wiclif, was burned at Perth, after having been convicted on no fewer than forty heretical charges. What those various heresies were, Bower, from whom the story is taken, does not say;[1] but at any rate, Resby declared that the Pope was not the Vicar of Christ, and that a man of wicked life was not to be acknowledged as Pope. The famous schism in the popedom had taken place; and the sight of rival Vicars of Christ fighting for the keys of St Peter made intelligent men ask themselves — Could even the best of Popes be the Vicar of Christ?

Every revolution which is a step of progress naturally begins with inquiry into the reason of existing authority; and when the representatives of any authority counted sacred, kings or governors or priests, are flagrantly wicked or pitifully weak and imbecile, the inquiry is apt to be summary. Resby, like many other reformers before the Reformation, examined and attacked the high claim of the Bishop of Rome, denied his authority, and was burned for such presumption. Scotland, in comparison

[1] Scotichr., xv. 20.

with other countries, was fortunately not generous in its gift of the martyr's crown, and Resby was the first to win the distinction.

The second name on the Scottish death-roll of religion is that of Paul Craw, a Bohemian, who was burned at St Andrews in 1433. He was reported to be a missionary of the opinions of Huss and Jerome of Prague; but the special charge made against him was that he denied the doctrines of transubstantiation, confession, and prayer to the saints.[1]

Towards the end of the fifteenth century, Blackadder, Archbishop of Glasgow, summoned thirty persons to answer to charges of heresy. Knox calls them the Lollards of Kyle, and mentions thirty charges of heresy preferred against them. These Lollards maintained that there should not be image or relic worship, that prayers should not be made to the Virgin, that the Pope had not authority to forgive sins, that the mass could not profit the souls of those said to be in purgatory. They held also that priests could lawfully marry, and they were charged with spreading the amusing doctrine that "we are not bound to believe all that doctors of the Kirk have written."

[1] Scotichr., xvi. 20.

Happily for the accused, the wit of one of them was so potent that "the greatest part of accusation was turned to laughter," and the proceedings terminated without the kindling of the fires.

These various heretics spent themselves in a vain endeavour to change the generally received doctrines of religion, and died without shaking the stability of the Church. The disaster of Flodden, and the civil troubles of the regency, did not afford the quiet needful to religious speculation; and not till the importation of the books of Martin Luther, and the receipt of information regarding the great events in Germany, was Scotland again roused from her dogmatic slumbers. In 1520 the Pope published his Bull of condemnation against Luther; and thus before Scotland had sacrificed a single martyr for the new opinions, the Reformation in Germany was an accomplished fact.

Patrick Hamilton was an avowed follower and preacher of the doctrines of the man whom the Roman Church had condemned; and though his family connections, in days of other political coalitions, might have saved him from the extreme penalty of the ecclesiastical and civil

law, it is difficult to see how otherwise he could have avoided the censure and escaped the punishment of a heretic and a law-breaker, unless, indeed, the chief dignitaries of the Scottish Church had themselves been in sympathy with the German Reformer.

Patrick Hamilton was the younger son of Sir Patrick Hamilton of Kincavil, in Linlithgow, and of Catherine Stewart, the illegitimate daughter of Albany, brother of James III.[1] The future martyr was thus allied to the king, to Albany, and to Arran; and his death by fire could not have been effected had not Angus consented to it. Hamilton, under the law which allowed those to draw the stipend who were unfit to perform the duties of a clerical office, was appointed when a boy Abbot of Ferne, in Ross. He was a student of the University of Paris, where in 1520 he took the degree of Master of Arts; and consequently must, for a short time at least, have been a fellow-student with David Beaton. In 1523 he entered the University of St Andrews, in order to carry on his studies under Major, the teacher of Buchanan and Knox, who contrived to sit undisturbed in his professional

[1] Douglas's Peerage.

chair, from which he prepared his students for their future heresies. In St Andrews, Hamilton speedily gained the reputation of heresy, but being threatened with prosecution he departed to Germany, attracted thither by the fame of Luther. If he went to Wittenberg, as has been asserted, he did not long remain there, but passed on to Marburg, where he enjoyed the teaching and the friendship of Francis Lambert.

Undismayed by the recollection of his threatened prosecution, and in spite of the warnings of his new friends, he returned to Scotland in 1527 to preach the Gospel as he now knew it, and to testify that he was a braver man now than when he fled from St Andrews. In all the accounts of him there is nothing to show that he reckoned for his safety on the inactivity and sloth of the Scottish prelates, or that he found himself the unexpected victim of his own rashness.

Hamilton was not a long time in Scotland before he was summoned to St Andrews, or rather invited, as if to a friendly conference with the Archbishop. His accusation and punishment speedily followed; and Knox declares that, though matters of greater importance had been in question, the articles for which he

suffered were pilgrimage, purgatory, prayer to saints and for the dead, "and such trifles." Lindsay of Pitscottie gives a graphic description of Hamilton's accusation, and of the manner of his death; and he and others narrate the vain attempts made to induce Hamilton to recant. The fire was kindled at St Andrews, and in the midst of it the martyr cried with a loud voice, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit: how long shall darkness overwhelm this realm? and how long wilt Thou suffer this tyranny of man?"

At the trial were present the two archbishops, with the bishops of Dunkeld, Brechin, and Dunblane; certain abbots, among whom was David, abbot of Aberbrothock; also certain other minor ecclesiastics. These all signed the sentence passed upon Hamilton; and in order to give that sentence greater authority, and probably to lessen the risk of the judges by increasing their number, the names of those of any reputation or rank in the University were added. Even the Earl of Cassilis, a boy of thirteen years of age, was made to sign the sentence. The prelates were astute; and this indiscriminate signing of the warrant of Hamilton's death points to the conclusion that the martyrdom was not a purely ecclesiastical affair,

and that the clergy were not willing to incur undivided responsibility for the act.[1]

The sentence is to be found in the appendix to Keith's 'Bishops'; but there is another document of more importance, the 'Treatise,' setting forth the youthful theologian's opinions on the law and faith. We are told in a later edition of Knox that "this servant of God, Mr Patrick Hamilton, was (besides his godly knowledge) well learned in philosophy: he abhorred sophistry." The pre-Reformation literature of Scotland is singularly free from theological discussion, and a special interest therefore attaches to this 'Treatise' on account of its author, and on account also of its isolated position in literature. The 'Treatise' was originally written in Latin, but a translation of it has been incorporated into Foxe's 'Martyrs' and Knox's 'History.' As is well known, the learned of those days wrote for the most part in Latin, and appealed but to a limited class of readers. From Hamilton's 'Treatise,' however, we learn what must have been the burden of his preaching—viz., the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith, which Luther had almost made his own. The 'Treatise' shows many signs of the logic

[1] Knox, Foxe, Spottiswood.

of the schools. Premises are laid down, and conclusions, of course, are drawn; and these form the basis of a new conclusion. This form of argumentation the logicians term a sorites; and nature or some benign power seems to have contrived it for behoof of dogmatic theologians. A sorites knows no limits of length, and abundant assertions are required to form the premises. For the most part, however, Hamilton's assertions are taken from the Scriptures; and indirectly the 'Treatise' is an emphasis of the Protestant doctrine of the absolute authority of the Bible. Sometimes the author is simply assertive, as where, after the fashion of the argumentations regarding the Trinity and the procession of the Holy Spirit, he speaks of the trinity of virtues, faith, hope, and charity, and declares that charity springs from faith and hope. That which is of interest in the 'Treatise' is the statement of the doctrine of justification by faith and the inefficiency of good works.

Scotland had not in these early years the faculty of ingenuity; there were Reformers in the fifteenth century, but they were followers of Wiclif or Huss. Now in the sixteenth century one of her sons produces a treatise on cer-

tain of the reformed doctrines, but he is a disciple of Martin Luther. Yet Patrick Hamilton shows a distinct advance in the progress of Scottish theological thought, just as, of course, Luther shows an advance on the teaching of the brave men who died before his day.

It is no longer isolated doctrines and practices of the Roman Church which are attacked; no longer simply the evil deeds of friars and the unlawful vagaries of prelates which are exposed. An appeal is made from the authority of the Roman Church to the authority of Scripture. The new learning is a return to the old, and so also is the new religion: instead of the doctrines formulated and the practices inculcated by Popes and councils, the Reformers take the doctrine of justification by faith and the practices laid down in the precepts of the New Testament.

The martyrdom of Hamilton was the best possible means of drawing attention to the doctrines for which he suffered. Hitherto the new religion had been, as it were, the produce of a foreign country; now the new faith was a native growth of Scotland. Criticism and scepticism began their work; and, as Knox quaintly puts it, the University of St Andrews

"began to smell somewhat of the Verity." Not only among the members of the University, but even among the Black Friars and the Grey Friars, the new faith advanced, so that there was further talk of martyrdom as a check on the advance of heresy. We owe to Knox the story of the wise "familiar" of Archbishop Beaton, who said to his master, "My lord, if ye burn any more, except ye follow my counsel, ye will utterly destroy yourselves: if ye will burn them, let them be burnt in hollow cellars; for the smoke of Mr Patrick Hamilton hath infected as many as it blew upon."

Apart from reformation, a policy of inactivity would best have served the Church party, as long as the martyrdom of Hamilton was fresh in the public memory; yet this policy, if completely carried out, would have brought about the ruin of the Church long before the actual occurrence of that event. Reformation was a course open to the Church, but this course was not pursued; on the contrary, David Beaton sternly opposed the Reformers, and thereby earned a lasting reputation as a cruel and bloodthirsty tyrant. Yet such was the success of his policy of persecution, that not till years

after the Reformation was an accomplished fact in Germany, and not till England had seen the Reformation under Henry and Edward checked under Mary and advanced again under Elizabeth, did Scotland verify the Reformation by permitting the first General Assembly of the Church.

CHAPTER V.

DIPLOMACY.

At Easter of 1528, the year of Patrick Hamilton's death, the Archbishop entertained the young king and the Douglases at St Andrews, giving them presents of gold and silver, and other gifts of "tacks and steadings."[1] Thus did he pacify the Douglases and secure their favour; and they, recently victorious over Margaret and her husband, and now deceived by the conduct of the Archbishop, began to relax their vigilant watch over the king. James, however, was resolved to free himself from the power of Angus, and was intriguing for this end with Beaton. He had secured the castle of Stirling from his mother, and had given her in exchange the lands of Methven, and the

[1] Lindsay of Pitscottie.

promise of a peerage for her husband. Moreover, he had persuaded Angus to allow him to pass from St Andrews to Falkland, then in the keeping of Beaton of Creich. Angus himself, weary of Fife, now went to Lothian, leaving to his uncle Archibald, to his brother George, and to James Douglas of Parkhead, the charge and custody of the king. Archibald, in the absence of Angus, took the opportunity of journeying to Dundee, possibly enticed by the charms of some mistress; while Sir George was induced to proceed to St Andrews, ostensibly to conduct business with Beaton, unwittingly to carry out the secret intrigue of that prelate. Douglas of Parkhead was left in sole charge at Falkland, and James, in pursuance of the plan of escape, intimated a great hunt to be held at Falkland, to which the surrounding tenants were invited. During the night preceding the proposed hunt, the king, dressed as a "yeoman of the stable," stole out of the castle, and taking with him two young grooms, rode to Stirling, and thus escaped from a guardianship which was a slavery. The escape of James, thus to appearance simply effected, but successful only through the help of the Archbishop, was to all intents a revolution in the country. The

supremacy of Angus was at an end, and thereafter the feeling of James toward the Douglases was one of intense hatred.

Young though he was, the king took the government of the country into his own hands. By judgment of the Parliament, the Douglases were declared guilty of treason. Angus was sentenced to death, and his estates were confiscated by law; but though he fled to England, the actual confiscation was not in those days a simple arrangement. He had held the office of chancellor, and was now, of course, deprived of the great seal. To this office James appointed his preceptor, Dunbar, Archbishop of Glasgow, a man highly praised even by the enemies of his Church, and described by Buchanan as "upright and learned, but rather deficient in political knowledge." James Beaton was certainly not deficient in political knowledge, and had been chancellor till Angus seized the office: his share in the plan of the king's escape might have entitled him to be restored to his former honours; but he was now an old man, and unfitted for the toils of the high office of chancellor. That he was not deposed, through any sinister feeling of the king towards him, is plain from the prominent position he took in

the council.[1] The claims of David Beaton, however, were not neglected; and although no office was found for him immediately on the fall of Angus, yet soon after that event he was appointed Lord Privy Seal, in succession to Crichton, Bishop of Dunkeld, and a little later received the further honour carried by the office of Protonotary Apostolic.

Thus early in his actual reign James came under the influence of the clergy—an influence which in a few years was to be supreme, and was to be detrimental to the power of the nobles. Of the clergy, David Beaton, who had been appointed among others to superintend the education of James,[2] was the one who was to secure and preserve the chief authority in the councils of the king. Whatever may be said about priestly politicians as a class, and about the impress they have left on the events of European history, it is to be remembered that before the Reformation prelates and priests were almost the only men fit for the offices of State which were not military. Protestant zeal is liable to condemn utterly the Roman priest for his creed, as the layman proud not to be

[1] State Papers (Henry VIII.), iv. p. 545.
[2] Lodge's Portraits—Beaton.

priest-ridden is apt to resent, irrespectively of time or place, all clerical interference in civil affairs; but Protestant zeal and the pride of the layman notwithstanding, the Scottish clergy of the Roman Church were as a class beyond comparison superior in intelligence and ability to the nobles, the only men likely to contend with them in the work of government. The very fact of the suppression of the Jesuits by Papal authority, shows that the prejudice against clerical interference in politics is not irrational; but Wolsey in England, and Richelieu and Mazarin in France, and even David Beaton in Scotland, are illustrious examples of European statesmen, not less illustrious because they were cardinals of the Roman Church.

When James chose his councillors from among the clergy, there was no one in Scotland equal in political experience to the Archbishop of St Andrews, no one superior in integrity and learning to the Archbishop of Glasgow, and no one comparable with David Beaton in political acuteness and in knowledge of the secrets and intrigues and policies of his contemporary statesmen in Europe. Angus was outlawed, Lennox was dead, Arran was weary of State concerns;

and although on various grounds some may lament the clerical influence which kept James away from Protestantism, it was well for him and for the independence of his country that he was free from the Douglases, and that he did not fall into the hands of another Angus, false to the best interests and the ancient traditions of the nation.

Throughout the years of his rule, Angus, though working also for his own ends, had been the tool of Henry in shaping the Scottish policy; and James was well aware that it was by his uncle's will and contrivance he was in subjection to Angus. James was not therefore ardent in his love towards his uncle, nor inclined to pursue Henry's political schemes. The young King of Scotland, brave, impetuous, self-willed, remembered that Flodden was still to be avenged, and that what to England was a glory was to Scotland a disaster; but James was compelled to use his patience and to wait. The turmoils of the regency and of the Douglas supremacy had left nothing in the royal treasury, and had divided the political and military interests; and James therefore was forced for the time to profess friendship towards England, which he did, in the first instance, by writing

to his uncle a dutiful letter of thanks for the benefits conferred on him during his minority.[1] Henry, moreover, had also to dissemble: the cause of Angus should have been his own, and now that Angus had fled to him he might have been expected to make good the losses of his faithful servant by demanding the restoration of the forfeited lands of the Douglases. But Henry solicited what he should have demanded, and by his solicitation gained nothing but a remission of the death sentence which had been passed on Angus.[2] Peace with Scotland was, however, the first consideration of the English king, who at this time was in league with Francis against the Emperor; and so a treaty of peace for five years, made for convenience' sake, was ratified 14th December 1528.[3]

James now turned his attention to home affairs, and set himself to humble the pride of his nobles, who had grown into petty kings during the lawless times of his minority. The pursuit of this policy gained for him the name of "King of the Commons"; but it also alienated even the outward loyalty and allegiance of many of the nobles, and cleared the way for

[1] State Papers (Henry VIII.), iv. p. 504. [2] Ibid., p. 547.
[3] Rymer, Fœdera, xiv. 286.

the dominance of the clergy in the government of the country. The Borders, Orkney, and the Isles were each the scene of disloyalty or revolt; but in each of those places the king established his authority. Argyle was deprived of his command, and Crawford of his land in the Isles; Bothwell, Murray, Maxwell, and Sir James Hamilton were variously punished. What offences they had committed cannot now be ascertained; but probably they incurred the royal condemnation by disobedience to the Acts of Parliament by which James intended to curtail their power. Those lawless nobles were not slow to transfer their allegiance to Henry, who was ever willing to purchase it.[1] In a letter written by Northumberland, of date 27th December 1531, we catch a glimpse of a very different English king from that one who professed affection for his nephew, and friendship for his nephew's country. Northumberland wrote that Bothwell, in conference with him, had expressed the hope that, with the favour of Angus and the help of the nobles estranged from James, he would be able to crown Henry in the town of Edinburgh.[2]

Henry may have allowed himself to be

[1] Conf. Tytler, ii. 9. [2] State Papers (Henry VIII.), iv. p. 598.

flattered with a vision of the realisation of this hope, and he had Angus at hand to tempt him into active hostility with Scotland. His Continental policy required peace with Scotland; but he did not favour the idea of James becoming a powerful and popular king. The subjugation of Scotland would satisfy his ambition; its dependence on England would suit his Continental policy; a settled peace between the two countries would be fatal to these plans of subjugation and dependence. Yet Henry was cautious not to declare war. He contented himself by sending Northumberland, in the winter of 1532, to make a raid on Scotland, such as might have delighted a Highland thief.[1]

Northumberland's expedition, whatever its ulterior purpose may have been, ended in a raid, since no rising of the Scots in favour of the English took place such as Henry possibly expected from the accounts of the disloyal nobles, and from the fact that Angus, with his uncle and brother, was in the company of Northumberland.[2] The Scots retaliated, and a Border warfare continued for more than a year. To complicate the relations of the two countries,

[1] State Papers (Henry VIII.), iv. p. 627. [2] Ibid., p. 629.

a force of four thousand Highlanders crossed to Ireland to help Henry's enemies there, but whether or not with the cognisance of James cannot be determined.[1] Henry at last grew tired of the Border warfare, and either intimated to Francis his intention of chastising the Scots in the hope that Francis would mediate for peace, or directly asked Francis as his ally to influence the Scots towards peace.[2] The French king accordingly sent an ambassador to Scotland; but James was angry at the neglect shown by Francis, and charged him with a willingness to sacrifice Scotland to England. James dismissed the French ambassador with letters to his king, which demanded a renewal of the ancient league that had been ratified anew in 1517; and in the same year, 1533, sent David Beaton and Sir Thomas Erskine to France to arrange this alliance, and to answer the charges made by Henry in regard to the Border warfare.[3]

Buchanan declares that Beaton took with him letters to the Parliament of Paris in reference to the renewal of the treaty of 1517,

[1] State Papers (Henry VIII.), iv. p. 612.

[2] Buchanan, xiv. 45.

[3] Ibid. State Papers (Henry VIII., Foreign and Domest.), vi. 190.

and in complaint of the neglect of Francis to adhere to the terms of that treaty. Buchanan further asserts that Beaton had instructions to proceed to Flanders to negotiate with the Emperor Charles, failing a satisfactory arrangement with Francis. Whatever Beaton's instructions may have been, as to demanding satisfaction for Francis's neglect of Scotland, it is highly probable that James did think to join himself to the Emperor, who had sought in certain marriage proposals to draw him away from any alliance with Henry and Francis.[1] Beaton, however, was commissioned with power to arrange a French marriage for James, in terms of the treaty of 1517; and Francis, therefore, was likely to agree to any reasonable proposals which would prevent Beaton's journey to the Emperor.[2] What specific arrangements Beaton made with the French king are not known; but that he brought matters to a peaceful conclusion is witnessed by the fact that a second ambassador proceeded to Scotland to propose a truce with England, and that James listened to the proposal. Monsieur de Bevois, the French

[1] State Papers (Henry VIII.), iv. p. 533.
[2] Buchanan, xiv. 45.

ambassador, accompanied the Scottish representatives to a conference with certain English representatives; and after many meetings, and the discussion of what were trifles to two nations, a truce was finally signed in 1534.[1]

In 1532, James, by Act of Parliament, established the College of Justice on the model of the Parliament of Paris, and was advised in the transaction of this business by the Archbishop of Glasgow, and most probably by David Beaton, who was familiar with the institutions of the French State.[2] James I. had created a Court of Session, which consisted of the chancellor and certain representatives of the three Estates of Parliament, and had appointed it to sit three times a-year, at places determined by the king;[3] but if Dunbar's satire on the transaction of legal affairs at Edinburgh be not a romance, there was justification for the reform carried through by James V. when he instituted the College of Justice. The new court was to hold its sittings in Edinburgh, and the judges were to be styled Senators of the College of Justice. As the

[1] Conf. Hamilton Papers, i. 10, 11.

[2] Drummond's Hist.—James V.

[3] Erskine's Institutes.

scheme was subsequently ratified by Act of Parliament, the Senators were to be fifteen in number,—seven laymen and seven churchmen, with a president, who was always to be a churchman.

James doubtless intended this Court to be a check on the lawless nobles in their tyranny over the commons; but in the process of establishing it, he came into conflict with the clergy. The religious houses were enormously wealthy, and a tax on them was the easiest means of raising money for State purposes. The nobles could resist a tax by force of arms, but the clergy had only spiritual weapons at their command, and sometimes these spiritual weapons were dangerous to those who used them. James had wisely resolved that the new Court should mean justice to the poor, and that justice should not be scanty on account of its price. He determined, therefore, to levy a tax from the clergy; but the Bishop of Aberdeen, in name of the clergy, protested to the Pope against this exaction, and Archbishop Beaton finally secured a Papal Bull, restricting the amount of the tax.[1] The Arch-

[1] State Papers (Henry VIII.), iv. p. 617. Conf. Mackay's Practice of the Court of Session, Introduction. This author

bishop, however, had to suffer for the use of this spiritual weapon, as in 1533 he was a prisoner in the castle of Edinburgh, on account of thwarting the purposes of the king.[1] Whatever may have been the intentions of James in founding the College of Justice, or of Beaton in advising him, the reconstituted Court was afterwards a powerful agent in the cause of the Church, when, as the "Secular Arm," it punished the breakers of the laws directed against heresy. Doubtless the aid which the Court gave to the Catholic Church, in the years preceding the Reformation, inspired the feeling with which Buchanan in his History attacked the first Senators of the College of Justice. Shortly after the new modelling of the Court of Session two changes were introduced, which seem to have been suggested by the usage of the tribunals of Rome, with which Beaton was familiar. Titles were assumed by the judges, and the Court was divided into an Outer and Inner House.[2]

James, in sending Beaton to France in 1533

notes the fact that in April 1541 a writ was issued to enforce payment from Cardinal Beaton of his share of the expense of the Court of Session.

[1] Conf. Hamilton Papers, i. 8.

[2] Brunton and Haig.

regarding the peace with England, gave his ambassador power to negotiate for him a matrimonial alliance with the daughter of Francis.[1] Much depended on the king's marriage. The Hamiltons, according to Buchanan, were anxious to prevent a marriage, so that their succession to the crown might be secure; and, as this writer does not hesitate to say, they even attempted the king's life. From the time of James's escape from Angus the marriage had been a subject of especial interest. Would the young king ally himself to England by taking the Princess Mary as his wife, and thus, perhaps, bind the two countries in a lasting peace? Henry again and again, in the course of his sinister dealings with Scotland, had proposed that James should be affianced to his daughter; but the affiance was never the chief end of his proposals, and did not take place.

When James assumed the actual government of his country, and entered into a correspondence with his uncle, the marriage with Mary was once more mooted; but the negotiations came to nothing, although the King of France, who was then in league with Henry, was favourable to the English match. By the

[1] Regist. Magn. Sigil. Reg. Scot., No. 1351.

treaty of Rouen of 1517,[1] the eldest daughter of Francis had been promised in marriage to James; but she had died, and his daughter Magdalen was thought too delicate in health ever to marry.[2]

The Emperor Charles, before Henry's divorce, strongly opposed this English match, as he feared a lasting peace between Scotland and England. He therefore sent his messenger to Scotland to offer his widowed sister, the Queen of Hungary, to James;[3] but this offer roused the opposition of Henry and Francis. Albany now suggested the Duchess of Urbino, widow of Lorenzo of Medici, and, though Henry would have agreed, James declined. Charles, at enmity with the Kings of France and England, and threatened by the Smalcaldic League, once more showed zeal in the question of the Scottish marriage. He promised Norway, a country not yet conquered by him, as a dower to any bride whom James might choose from among the friends of the Emperor. Buchanan relates how Charles sent his ambassador secretly

[1] A copy of this treaty is given in Teulet, i. pp. 4-8.

[2] Francis, in 1533, gave a consent to the marriage of James and Magdalen, subject to the improvement of Magdalen's health. —Teulet, i. 77.

[3] Diurn. of Occur., 1529.

to Scotland, in the year 1534, to excite James against Henry, and to urge upon the young king that the marriage with Ann Boleyn would probably remove him from the succession to the English crown. The ambassador, in his master's name, offered James the choice of a wife from among three Maries—Mary of Hungary, Mary of Portugal, and Mary of England, now that the mother of the last-named princess had been divorced from Henry. Still another lady was mentioned, the Emperor's niece, the daughter of the deposed King of Denmark; but she was already affianced to another, and James was on friendly terms with the reigning sovereign of Denmark. None of the proposed marriages took place. In the Supplement to Dempster it is suggested that Beaton showed James that the Emperor and the Pope were trying to make a tool of him by these marriage projects. James hardly required Beaton as his adviser in a case so obvious; nor is Beaton richer in his reputation for political sagacity by having ascribed to him an understanding of the self-evident policy of the Emperor. There is no doubt, however, that Beaton with his French sympathies preferred an alliance with France, and it may safely be concluded that with his control

over the King of Scotland he endeavoured to prevent not only the alliance with England, on account of his suspicions of Henry, but also the alliance with Charles, who was beyond his political influence.

When Francis acted as negotiator in 1534 between Scotland and England, James was induced by him to ask for the hand of the Princess Mary;[1] but the divorce of Catherine was but a recent event, and Henry refused to permit the marriage lest Mary, as the daughter of his lawful wife, and James should be counted the heirs to the English throne, to the prejudice of any children he might have by Ann Boleyn. In 1535, however, Henry, anxious that his nephew should repudiate the Papal authority, proposed a meeting with him;[2] but this proposal was viewed with disfavour by the Hamiltons, who feared that a marriage would be fatal to their hopes, and by the clergy, who were deeply concerned not to let James fall into the hands of so determined an enemy of Rome as the King of England. The meeting did not take place; and Henry, ever ready of resource, gave instructions to his ambassadors in Scot-

[1] Conf. Lingard, vi. v.
[2] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. p. 1 *et seq.*

land to oppose a marriage then projected between James and Mary of Bourbon, daughter of the Duke of Vendome.[1] Henry saw in this marriage the alliance of the Scottish king with the Catholic party, and resolved in every way to prevent it. But Henry's objections were not likely to be of weight with the council of James, which was dominated by the clergy, seeing that Henry had already suggested the demolition of the Scottish religious houses.[2] Moreover, James by this time had sent David Beaton and certain Scottish nobles to France to make the final settlement for the Vendome marriage.[3] Francis, though he had refused his daughter Magdalen in marriage to the Scottish king, was willing to give any one of the princesses of the blood: accordingly, a marriage with Mary of Vendome was agreed to by treaty, March 6, 1536.[4] In the autumn of 1536 James, weary, it is said, of the obstacles placed in his way by Henry and the Hamiltons, resolved to proceed to France to see the lady chosen for him by his ambassadors.[5] He landed in France with a train of nobles, among whom

[1] Hamilton Papers, i. 26.
[2] Ibid., i. 22.
[3] Ibid., 18, 20, 21.
[4] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. p. 41.
[5] Ibid., p. 59.

was Beaton; but went alone in disguise to Vendome to see his intended bride. Lindsay of Pitscottie gives a graphic description of the scene at Vendome, and the rejoicings there for eight days, after the lady had recognised her disguised lover. The scene and the rejoicings were probably what in Lindsay's imagination ought to have been; but for some reason or other James was disappointed with the bride. Like a heartbroken swain of ballad romance, he left for the wars; but meeting the King of France, he journeyed with him to Paris, and there fell violently in love with Magdalen, whose passion in return was equally strong. Robertson, the historian of Charles V.,[1] declares, on the other hand, that James went on a military expedition to help the King of France in his war with the Emperor. There is another story to the effect that, against the wish of his nobles, James proposed to marry the divorced daughter of Lord Erskine, the lady who was mother to his son, James Stewart, afterwards Earl of Murray.[2] Whatever may have been the exact purpose of James's voyage to France, there is no doubt that his passion for Magdalen

[1] History of Charles V., Book vi.
[2] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. pp. 41, 46.

was sincere. Young, but sicklied o'er with the hectic cast of consumptive beauty, Magdalen was no wife for James to take from France to Scotland. Yet, in spite of prudence, the marriage was solemnised in Paris with great pomp on the 1st January 1537,[1] in presence of princes and of prelates, among whom Beaton is mentioned; and after a few months James and his young wife departed for Scotland, where they landed in the month of May. There is nothing more pathetic in Scottish history than the story of the marriage of James and Magdalen. She arrived in Scotland in May; but her new country was not a sunny France, and in July she was dead. There is a touching grace in Lindsay's description of her landing: "And when the queen came in Scottish ground she bowed and inclined herself to the earth, and took the muilds thereof and kissed; syne thanked God that he had brought her safely through the sea with her husband to their own country."[2] Five years after her death, when her husband died also, he was buried beside her in the Abbey of Holyrood.

[1] Diurn. of Occur. Teulet, i. 106.

[2] Lindsay of Pitscottie's History. Conf. Sir D. Lindsay's "The Deploration of the Death of Quene Magdalen."

One custom new to Scotland sprang from the sadness of her fate. Out of respect for her memory the people then for the first time wore mourning clothes.[1] Mary of Bourbon, Lindsay relates, "within short while took sickness and died"; though Bishop Lesley, a better authority, says she spent the rest of her life in a convent. There is still a third authority as to what came of her. Penman, writing from Paris to Sir George Douglas in October 1536, intimates that on the same day as James and Magdalen were to be married, "shal be maryed the Duke of Wandome doughter, the which the kyng shuld have had, to the Counte of Auvars."[2]

James, though he sincerely mourned the death of Magdalen, quickly set about arranging another marriage. His clerical advisers probably feared that the question of the English match would be reopened; and James himself, menaced by the Hamiltons and the Douglases, was anxious to preserve the succession to the crown in his own line. Shortly after the death of Magdalen, Beaton and the Earl of Murray were sent as ambassadors to France, with instructions to ask in marriage, in the king's name, Mary, daughter of the Duke of Guise,

[1] Buchanan. [2] Pinkerton, vol. ii., Appendix.

and widow of the Duke de Longueville.[1] Buchanan asserts that James, while in France and fearing the early death of Magdalen, had fixed his thoughts on Mary of Guise; but though this assertion is hardly credible, James at all events must have seen the lady whom his ambassadors were now to seek in marriage for him.

Henry VIII. having lost his wife, Jane Seymour, was also suitor for the hand of Mary of Guise; but whether the lady preferred the younger king, or whether the arrangements were altogether matters of political diplomacy, James and she were at last married by proxy in France in January 1538.[2] In June of the same year she landed in Scotland and proceeded to St Andrews, where, amidst pomps and pageantries, and also allegorical ceremonies, of which Sir David Lindsay was the author, she was married to the king. Beaton, now Coadjutor-Archbishop of St Andrews, officiated.[3] In the following year, when a son was born to the king and queen, Beaton and the Archbishop of Glasgow were godfathers to the child; and later in the same year, when

[1] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. p. 112.
[2] Lesley, p. 155; Teulet, i. 115. [3] Diurn. of Occur., 1539.

Mary was publicly crowned in Holyrood as Queen of Scotland, the crown was placed upon her head by Beaton.[1] Lindsay of Pitscottie declares that Beaton was angry, especially with the Lord Maxwell, to whom the charge of the queen was intrusted, because he was not allowed even to journey in the same vessel with Mary as she crossed from France. Be this as it may, Mary and Beaton were destined to be henceforth joined together as the strong supporters of the Catholic Church. Magdalen de Valois had been trained by her aunt, the Queen of Navarre, who favoured the Huguenot party in France; but Mary was of the inner circle of those who championed the Catholic cause in Europe, and if Beaton did not suggest the marriage of James with Mary, he had reason to be glad that the king's choice had fallen upon her. Till the day of Beaton's death, Mary of Guise and he were the two dominating powers in the government of Scotland, and were zealous alike in their opposition to England, their favour of France, and their support of the Catholic Church.

In the interval between the French marriages, Beaton was sent as ambassador to Eng-

[1] Diurn. of Occur., 1539.

land, touching certain difficulties which had arisen concerning the Borders, and regarding a complaint that fugitives and rebels from England were harboured and aided in Scotland.[1] Margaret had written to Henry announcing Beaton's embassy, and praying him to take kindly with the Abbot of Arbroath, as he was "gret vyth the kyng."[2]

There is no record of the details of any meeting between Henry and Beaton, though doubtless they met in council and also privately, as Beaton wrote to Cromwell requesting a meeting with Henry.[3] If Beaton's request was granted, the meeting was the first and only one between those two men, who were afterwards to be bitter enemies, and to hate each other with a hatred strangely at variance with the teaching either of the old or new faith.

Little is known of the object of this mission to England, and less is known of what was arranged. It is plain, however, that Beaton was not unskilful in the ambassador's art of making fair promises, since Norfolk wrote to Cromwell, "I do somethyng doubte that the imbassatour of Scotland hath not so frankely

[1] State Papers (Henry VIII), v. p. 106.
[2] Ibid., p. 90. [3] Ibid., p. 99.

wryten to his Maister as he sayde at Grafton he wold do."[1]

The services rendered by Beaton to France were not unrewarded. Francis, throughout the diplomatic business of the alliance and the marriages, had learned the value of Beaton's sympathies with France and antipathies towards England, and had resolved to foster these feelings by material aids. Churchmen, in those days of their political power, counted on rewards more tangible than the prizes in a spiritual kingdom. Forman, the predecessor of James Beaton in St Andrews, contrived to gain substantial favours from the Pope and from the Kings of France, England, and Scotland; Wolsey was enriched by the Emperor and by the Kings of France and England, and was rewarded by the Pope. According to fashion, therefore, and to expectations common to men of his order, Beaton received recognition from Francis. On 5th December 1537 he was consecrated to the bishopric of Mirepoix in Languedoc. This gift, by virtue of the Concordat which superseded the Pragmatic Sanction, was in the hands of the king to bestow; and being of the annual value of 10,000 livres,

[1] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. p. 101.

was no mean addition to the income of the Scottish prelate.[1] In 1539 considerable property in French land was bestowed upon him, and though he had been nationalised as a French subject previous to his consecration to the bishopric of Mirepoix, it was specially written down in the Act conferring the property upon him that his heirs, though born out of France, should be legal inheritors of the property.[2] Francis, alive to the importance of Scotland's union with France in European contests, exerted his influence with the Pope, as James had already done, to gain for Beaton the cardinal's hat. Paul III., not slow to see that Scotland was of value to Rome, readily agreed to the request of Francis; and Beaton was accordingly created cardinal of St Stephen in Monte Coelio, in December 1538. This title was not unknown in the history of the Scottish Church: it was that borne by John de Salerno, who presided at a meeting of the clergy at Perth, in the reign of William the Lion. Among Scottish-born ecclesiastics before Beaton, there had been but one cardinal, Walter Wardlaw, Bishop of

[1] Lawson's Catholic Church in Scotland, p. 81.

[2] See notice of the collection of his rents.—Hamilton Papers i. p. lxxi.

Glasgow, who flourished towards the end of the fourteenth century.[1] Thus Beaton might have rejoiced to possess the red hat, if for no other reason than the rarity of the honour. A cardinal was in power and dignity a prince of the Catholic Church, and one of the most intricate threads of ecclesiastical and civil history is that on which are strung the schemes, intrigues, strifes of the candidates for the coveted rank. Dubois, Archbishop of Cambrai, during the period of the regency in France, in the early part of the eighteenth century, solicited this dignity; and it has been said that all Europe was enlisted for this red hat. Eight million livres were spent in the quest of it; and one Pope died rather than give the hat to Dubois, while the next Pope died through shame of having given it.

There seems, however, to have been no difficulty in obtaining for Beaton the title of cardinal, young though he was, and native of a land from which the princes of the Church had not been chosen. The reason for this honour to a Scottish prelate is not hard to find. The Pope was thus able not only to please the Kings of

[1] He was made a cardinal by Urban VI., and therefore his title has been disputed.

France and Scotland, but to further in Scotland the interests of Rome. Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, had been marked by the Pope for promotion to the rank of cardinal, that he might the more zealously and powerfully guard the fortunes of the Roman Church against the attacks of the Reformers; but Henry sent Fisher to the stake before the hat arrived, and so thoroughly severed himself from the authority of Rome that, while he lived, the Papal authority was a lost cause in England. Scotland, however, might still be saved to the Pope. To this end a cap and sword were consecrated for James by his Holiness himself; the title of Defender of the Faith, forfeited by Henry, was promised to the Scottish king; and upon Beaton, the ablest man of his country, the rank of cardinal was conferred, in the hope that the honour would be an incentive to him to guard the Church.

In 1539 Beaton, already coadjutor, succeeded his uncle as Archbishop of St Andrews. Owing to the weakness of age, James Beaton before his death had left the duties of his various offices in Church and State to his nephew. He had been made Provost of the Church of Bothwell in 1503; had afterwards been ap-

pointed Prior of Whitehern and Abbot of Dunfermline; later, Abbot of Arbroath and Kilwinning; from the bishopric of Galloway had passed to the archbishopric of Glasgow; and finally, in 1522, had been installed in the Primate's see of St Andrews. On the other hand, he had been Treasurer of the kingdom in 1505, and in 1515 had become Chancellor. Able as a prelate and politician for untroubled times, worthy to be head of a Church which did not make personal piety its first demand, he was too old and too weak of body to guard the fortunes of the ancient Scottish Church, in the days of fierce attack against it; nor did his political experience, resource, and cunning amount to the genius needed for a leader in times of revolution. He was neither a great man nor in any special sense a good man though his ability was far removed from the dull monotony of mediocrity, and his morality was far above the reputation of the monk of romantic verse.[1] In Glasgow

[1] In 1535 James sent to Pope Paul III. a remarkable document in which he charged the Archbishop with being the cause of all the troubles in the State. The king alleged that the Archbishop had declared that he would not willingly die till he had seen the Scottish crown on the head of Arran, his niece's son. No mention of such a plot is made by the contemporary Scottish historians.—Teulet, i. p. 81.

he was known as a benefactor. A wall round the castle, a new altar in the choir of the cathedral, bridges over the Clyde, were erected at his expense; while in St Andrews he constituted himself a patron of learning, by founding the College of St Mary's. When he died in 1539, there stood ready as his successor a man more fitted than he to be the head of Church and State; and tradition has ascribed to that successor a character of greater intellectual genius, but of less moral respectability.

In 1539, then, David Beaton was archbishop and cardinal. He might hope to be chancellor; but his ambition was set upon his being legate *a latere*, the vicegerent of the Pope in Scotland, in order that he might not only possess the highest ecclesiastical dignity next to that of the Pope, but that he might also have the power and the authority to carry out a thorough coercive policy against the enemies of the ancient faith.[1] A legate *a latere* was armed, in countries where allegiance to Rome was still professed, with an authority that could dispense with the aid of secular judges; and

[1] James in December 1538 wrote to the Pope, requesting the legateship for Beaton.

this authority gave its possessor a power dangerous alike to his personal enemies and to the enemies of his Church. A legate *a latere* enjoyed the prerogative expressed in the saying of Gregory VII., "Nostra vice quæ corrigenda sunt corrigat, quæ statuenda constituat." But so far-reaching was this prerogative that Beaton was strenuously opposed in his demand for it. From Beaton's letters to his agent, Andrew Oliphant,[1] it is plain that his enemies opposed at Rome his getting legatine power, but that he pressed his claims on the ground of the need of such powers to stamp out the new and growing heresy. Beaton alone of living men, if man were able, could save the ancient faith in Scotland; and the Pope therefore was willing enough for his own cause to grant Beaton the legatine power which he solicited, and at last in 1544 obtained.[2]

[1] See Sadler's Papers, vol. i. p. 13 *et seq.*

[2] Preface to Liber Arbroth.

CHAPTER VI.

THE EXTIRPATION OF HERESY.

The accession of Beaton to the primacy of the Scottish Church was followed by a policy of the type which, in the language of later times, is named thorough or coercive. Coercionists and anti-coercionists are separated on the question whether man is for the law or the law is for man; and while the former lay emphasis upon law as the safeguard against anarchy, the latter see in its vigorous enforcement a possible source of tyranny. Progress is achieved through the repeal of effete laws and the enactment of new ones; but progress owes its chief stimulus to the revolutionist and the law-breaker; and to stand for the supremacy of the law is by no means always the same as to stand for the supremacy of right.

Beaton had definite Acts of Parliament against

heresy to justify the policy which he adopted. As primate of the Church it came within his province to make sure that those statutes were maintained and honoured. Yet no lover of liberty would attempt to justify Beaton's procedure against the Lutheran heretics, though the policy he pursued was based upon specific Acts of Parliament and fortified by the conclusions deduced from an abstract system of State ethics.

Officers of any institution are the appointed guardians of its laws, and into this guardianship private feeling must not enter. The officers must administer justice according to the statutes, not distribute mercy or favour according to the dictates of their own hearts. Better the suffering of individuals, better the charge of State tyranny, than the infringement of the impartiality, the slur on the majesty and supremacy of the law, by the discretion or indiscretion of officers. This ethic is sound enough when the sanctity of duty, the excellence of justice, the grace of impartiality can be emphasised without reference to unjust laws, and to that administration of laws which some call tyranny and others persecution.

Beaton, as head of the Church, was guardian of the laws which aimed at securing its unity and the purity of its doctrine: on him therefore was laid the duty of enforcing those laws, though individuals should have to suffer in consequence. Yet in fulfilling this duty he brought to light the harshness of the laws concerning heresy, and incurred an odium that has lasted for centuries.

The idea of toleration has now largely taken the place of the idea that the Church must be kept pure by the extirpation of heretics. Church History, while it is a Book of Martyrs for lovers of religious progress, is also a Book of Heroes for the zealots who cling to the theory of extirpation and reverence the memory of the extirpators; but those zealots have become few, and toleration has begotten in most men indiscriminate admiration of all martyrs and abhorrence of all heresy-hunters. Yet when the plea is urged that the extirpator of heresy acts as for the cause of the Head of the Church, and when history shows certain tender-hearted inquisitors in Spain as eager for the glory of Christ as were some of the stern-hearted Covenanters of Scotland, does not charity demand that this abhorrence be not unqualified? Nothing is more

a subject for wonder than the diverse roads which men tread for the sake of Christ; and though we do not ask for mercy to the memory of Beaton as an extirpator of heretics, charity demands that we should see if religious zeal inspired his coercive policy; justice requires us to remember that toleration was unknown in his age; while the "equity of history" bids us measure him by the standard of the men of his own times.

In the sixteenth century toleration was found in More's Utopia but not in Christendom. An apologist might therefore urge that, though tradition condemns Beaton for tyranny, the blame ought to fall on the time rather than on the man; and, further, might plausibly contend that, as religious persecution in Scotland was insignificant in quantity compared with the persecutions in England, France, Spain, Holland, the chief extirpator of the Lutheran heretics in Scotland has gained a notoriety excessive because of the rarity of persecution in the hands of others. The "equity of history" itself, however, furnishes an answer to the apologist. Since religious persecution was on the whole, before and after, insignificant in Scotland, the director of the actual persecution is

justly singled out for censure; and since the Archbishop of Glasgow,[1] the prelate next in dignity to the primate, counselled a milder policy than the Cardinal's—not perhaps for toleration's sake, but for the sake of the prosperity of the Church — Beaton's reputation must take the consequences of his employment of the methods of coercion.

"The smoke of Mr Patrick Hamilton infected" St Andrews, so that the place which once was the capital of Catholicism became the centre of the new heresy. The students of the university, the novices of the abbey, "began to smell somewhat of the verity," and even Black and Grey friars were to be found preaching against the abuses of the Church. One William Arithe, who was not then or afterwards a Lutheran, so ridiculed in his sermons the special abuses of "cursing" and of pretended miracles, giving at the same time illustrative specimens of "cursing" by friars, that he excited the wrath of the Bishop of Brechin, and raised the question whether or not such ridicule was heresy. The friar postponed the settlement of this nice question by fleeing to England, where, for defending the supremacy of the

[1] Knox's History, Bk. i.

Pope, he was dragged to one of Henry's prisons.

Knox chronicles the preaching of this friar as that of a Balaam's ass whose mouth God had opened to condemn the vices of the clergy.[1] About the same time a certain man named Alexander Furrour, having returned from England after a seven years' imprisonment in the Tower of London, was charged with the crime of speaking openly in complaint of a churchman who had entertained his wife during his absence. There was no question to settle in this case: Furrour was a heretic for bearing testimony against a churchman; but he pleaded guilty and so was set free, to the relief of the clerical judges.[2]

Alexander Seton, confessor of the king, declared not only against the scandals of the Church, but in favour of certain of the new doctrines. During a season of Lent he openly pleaded for the idea of justification by faith, and found occasion to say that, according to St Paul, there were no true bishops in Scotland. It was reported to the Archbishop of St

[1] Knox's History, Bk. i.

[2] Ibid. The curious will find, from the 'Registrum Visitationum' of the Archbishop of Rouen (1248-1269), that Furrour's was no uncommon case.

Andrews that Seton had asserted that "it behoved a bishop to be a preacher, or else he were but a dumb dog, and fed not the flock, but fed his own belly." Seton, in presence of the Archbishop and to his delight, maintained that they who alleged such things were liars. This delight was changed, however, when the Archbishop heard the words of the accused. "Consider what ears these asses have, who cannot discern betwixt Paul, Isaiah, and Zechariah and Malachai, and friar Alexander Seton. In very deed, my lord, I said that Paul saith, 'It behoveth a bishop to be a teacher'; Isaiah said, 'That they that feed not the flocks are dumb dogs'; and Zechariah saith, 'They are idle pastors.'" The Pope himself could not have ventured to condemn Seton for preaching the words of the Bible; but this friar, being the confessor of the king, could not, without danger to the interests of the Church, be left near the royal presence. A charge of heresy was therefore preferred against him, and James, suffering from the stern precepts of this confessor, was glad to escape to a more lenient director of his conscience. Seton, accordingly, had to seek the road to England.[1]

[1] Knox's History, Bk. i.; Spottiswood, pp. 64, 65.

Such persecutions as these were not of sufficient seriousness to establish a grave charge of tyranny against the Church, nor to damage the reputation of David Beaton, or whoever counselled the persecutions. In 1533, however, another was added at St Andrews to the roll of martyrs. Henry Forrest, a young Benedictine, was burned for the sin of possessing an English Bible, and of being an admirer of Patrick Hamilton. In 1534 a court of heresy was held in Edinburgh, then included in the diocese of St Andrews. During the sitting of the court, David Beaton was in France, and the Bishop of Ross therefore presided as commissioner for the Archbishop. If the martyrdom of Patrick Hamilton was, in part, the result of David Beaton's counsels, then one may judge that this court was held, not to satisfy the zeal of the Archbishop, but that of his more energetic nephew. Among those summoned to answer the charge of heresy there were, besides three citizens of Leith, an advocate named Johnston, Henderson, the master of the Grammar School of Edinburgh, and the brother and sister of Patrick Hamilton. James Hamilton, the brother, who was sheriff of Linlithgow, by advice of the king did not appear; while the sister, in order

to please James, made a show of recantation, which saved the scandal of the martyrdom of another of the Hamiltons. Of the accused, however, two were condemned and executed.[1]

David Straiton incurred the wrath of the Bishop of Moray over a question of tithes. He bade his servants throw back every tenth salmon or trout into the sea, and told the bishop's officers to seek for the tithe where the servants got the stock. He was threatened with prosecution for contempt of the bishop's orders, but increased the contempt by paying no heed to the threat. As Straiton, however, was known to be a friend and convert of Erskine of Dun, afterwards famous in the Reformed Church, a charge of heresy was brought against him, and on this charge he was condemned to be burned. Along with Straiton was burned Norman Gourlay, a priest, who had declared against purgatory, had affirmed that the Pope was antichrist, and had married in defiance of the canon law.[2] As if to witness to this reign of terror, certain scholars, whom their country could ill spare, fled from Scotland. Among these were Alesius, who became professor of

[1] Knox, Calderwood, Spottiswood. [2] Ibid.

divinity at Leipsic, and the learned Machabæus, known as one of the translators of the Danish Bible.[1]

In 1539 the policy of persecution was carried out with increasing zeal. In February of that year the Cardinal and, as Knox terms him, "the incestuous Bishop of Dunblane," proceeded to Edinburgh to try certain heretics. During several years no one had been burned at the stake, but these were the years when Beaton was engaged with diplomatic affairs in France. This fact bears out the probability that Beaton was the author of the coercive policy which, beginning with the martyrdom of Patrick Hamilton, fell into disuse when Beaton was absent from Scotland, and sprang into full vigour again when he returned with Mary of Guise. Of those condemned before the inquisitions at Edinburgh, four were ecclesiastics and one was a layman. Still from the ranks of churchmen the martyrs' roll was made up; and the very class of men who in the ancient Church soiled the uses of religion, gave to the new faith almost all the witnesses who died for it. The four ecclesiastics proceeded against were John Keillor and John Beveridge, of the order of

[1] Burnet's History of the Reformation, iii. i.

the Black Friars, Duncan Simpson, a priest of Stirling, and Thomas Forret, the vicar of Dollar. Along with them was condemned Robert Forrester, a notary at Stirling.

Keillor had written a "miracle" play which was acted before the king at Stirling. The subject of the play was the passion of Christ, and the allusions to the priests and the Pharisees who persuaded Pilate to condemn Christ, suggested to the people the priests who induced James to persecute the men of the new religion. Unfortunately for the students of literature and of Church history, the play has not been preserved; but the memory of it is established through the martyrdom of its author. Forret, the vicar of Dollar, had been in the habit of preaching every Sunday, though preaching was deemed a privilege of the friars: moreover, he had taught the people to say the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments; and had given offence because he had not taken "the cow and the uppermost" perquisites to the vicar, for saying prayers for the dead person's escape from purgatory. For these sins, some time before this trial, he had been brought before the Bishop of Dunkeld, who made reply to the accused: "I thank God I never knew

either the Old or New Testament"—words which caused the name of the bishop to pass into a proverb.[1]

The five men were burned on the Castle Hill of Edinburgh; and, as if to give dignity to the scene, King James was present as a spectator.[2] Calderwood asserts that Forret had been "diverse times" summoned before the Bishops of St Andrews and Dunkeld, but had escaped punishment till he fell under the stronger power of David Beaton. If this statement is true, it affords further evidence that the aged Archbishop of St Andrews was not the author of the coercive policy which was carried out under his name and authority.

The spread of the new faith was not confined to the east of Scotland. In the west also there were heretics, but the Archbishop of Glasgow was not zealous for the coming of the kingdom of God by coercion and persecution. David Beaton, as cardinal and as coadjutor with the primate of the Church, was not willing, however, to leave the west of Scotland free for the growth of heresy. Shortly after the sitting of the clerical court in Edinburgh, he sent emis-

[1] Knox, Spottiswood.
[2] Household Book of James—March 1, 1539.

saries to Glasgow, to act with the Archbishop in holding an assize of inquisition. Jeremy Russel, a young man of the Grey Friars, and Alexander Kennedy, a lad not eighteen years of age, were summoned to appear before these judges. Kennedy is described by Knox as being "one of excellent wit in vulgar poetry," but we are left to wonder if, like Keillor or like the greater Buchanan, he had held up the clergy to the scorn of the people. Kennedy, at the opening of the trial, showed signs of a failing faith; but the exhortations of Russel strengthened him, and these two, after making a good confession, were burned on a spot near the Archbishop's castle in Glasgow. The Archbishop, to his praise, did not willingly let them suffer. "I think it better to spare these men than to put them to death," he said to the commissioners of the Cardinal. The commissioners in anger answered him: "What will ye do, my lord? Will ye condemn all that my lord Cardinal, and the other bishops, and we have done? If so ye do, ye show yourself enemy to the Church and us, and so we will repute you, be ye assured."[1]

Possibly this prelate, jealous for the pre-

[1] Knox's History, Bk. i.

rogative of the see of Glasgow, as against the primacy of St Andrews, opposed a policy which originated at St Andrews because it originated there. His life, however, was that of a man of peace, and we may therefore believe that he honestly set himself against persecution. It would be unwarrantable to ascribe to the Archbishop the spirit of toleration which a century later began to descend upon the Christian Church; but even an archbishop may be credited with having felt pity for prisoners as young as Kennedy and Russel, and his judgment probably suggested to him that the safety of the Church was to be secured by gentler measures than the doing to death of those who pressed for this or that reform.[1]

At the court held in Edinburgh, besides those sentenced to the stake and nine who recanted, there were, according to Buchanan, many who were banished. Buchanan himself was sentenced to imprisonment, and but for the king would probably have added one to the number of the martyrs on the Castle Hill of Edinburgh.[2] In 1537 he wrote a satire, 'Som-

[1] See the character given to him in Buchanan's 'Coena Gavini Archiepiscopi Glascuensis.'

[2] History, xiv. 55.

nium,' which gave offence to the Franciscans; and subsequently produced that more bitter satire 'Franciscanus,' written at the request or order of James—then offended with the Franciscans—in which the ignorance and sensuality of the friars were ruthlessly exposed. Buchanan was imprisoned in the castle of St Andrews, from which escape would have been impossible had not succour come to him. But he escaped to France, probably with the knowledge of the king, who, according to Buchanan himself,[1] had taken a bribe from Beaton for his imprisonment, and by the help of James Beaton the future bishop. We are not here concerned with Buchanan's career, save with a single incident of it. On one occasion he came face to face with the Cardinal on the streets of Paris, and the sight of Buchanan stirred again the wrath of Beaton. Beaton's vindictive cruelty is shown by the fact that he sought, by letter to the bishop of the diocese wherein Buchanan resided, to have Buchanan sent to Scotland. Fortunately for Buchanan and for scholarship, the letter was intercepted and did not reach the bishop; but we see in Beaton's conduct cruelty and persecuting tyranny, inexcusable even on

[1] Vita.

the ground, which might in other cases afford pretext if not excuse, that the safety of the Scottish Church required the extirpation of those whose presence was a source of danger.[1]

One of the first public acts of the Cardinal, when he had reached the full dignity of primate of Scotland, was the holding of a council at St Andrews for the purpose of considering the position of ecclesiastical affairs. Beaton was now not only cardinal, but archbishop and *legatus natus*, and the ceremonial of the council must be fitting his dignity. Earls and barons, bishops and abbots, with crowds of men of lesser name, marched in procession to the cathedral, where, on a dais raised above the rest, sat the Cardinal—higher in rank than the other titled lay and priestly defenders of the national religion. The Cardinal addressed the assembly, and spoke of the spread of heresy and the dangers which threatened the Church. The chief man among the heretics, Sir John Borthwick, had been summoned to appear before the council; but, too wary to trust the mercy of the priests, had fled to Henry. Borthwick was captain of the king's French Guards, and had been guilty, according to the

[1] Irving's Life of Buchanan.

indictment, of dispersing heretical books and of maintaining doctrines contrary to the faith of the Church. As he himself was not within reach, he was sentenced on the 28th May 1540 to be burned in effigy; and it remains a question whether or not this burning by effigy entitles Borthwick to a place on the honourable roll of Scottish martyrs.[1]

Shortly after the council held at St Andrews had risen a court of inquisition was established, with Sir James Hamilton, natural brother of the Earl of Arran, as its head. This man was above suspicion in his attachment to the Church, and was likely to prove a valued instrument of persecution; but he had mixed himself up with the political intrigues of the Douglases, and it required skill on the part of the clergy to induce James to favour his appointment. James, however, was always poor and needy, and the confiscated property of the heretics was grateful to him if their punishment was not.

Hamilton did not live to gain a reputation as a judge of an inquisitorial court. According to Drummond, he resolved to make an example of his cousin, the brother of Patrick Hamilton, who had by the king's permission

[1] Keith's History.

returned to Scotland. This Hamilton, ex-sheriff of Linlithgow, incensed by the threats of the new inquisition, exposed an old plot for the murder of the king, in which Sir James Hamilton had a principal share. The judge's doom was sealed; the clergy could not save him; the extirpation of heretics must find another instrument; and so this court of inquisition collapsed by the execution of its judge in August 16, 1540.[1]

The Cardinal seems to have been for a time out of favour with James after Hamilton's execution. The king was morbid over plots against his life and safety, and cruel to those who planned them. Probably, therefore, his anger against the Cardinal was due to the fact that Beaton had recommended the appointment of Hamilton as a judge.[2]

Sometime between this date and that of the battle of Solway, there was in existence a list of the names of certain persons suspected of heresy, whose property might be useful to fill the king's coffers. Tradition has used this list in evidence against the character of Beaton.

[1] Drummond, History of James V.; Lindsay of Pitscottie; Keith.

[2] The Hamilton Papers, i. 57.

According to the story, the Cardinal, after the death of Sir James Hamilton, prepared a list of three hundred and sixty persons, noblemen and gentlemen, suspected of heresy, and presented it to the king. The property of those heretics would have enabled the king to meet the hostile approaches of Henry; but James, on the advice of his Treasurer, Kirkaldy of Grange, not only refused to make war on the suspected heretics, but turned in anger against the prelates, and lectured them on their disorderly lives. James, however, was not likely to risk the anger of the prelates at a time when, threatened by his uncle, he needed their advice and their financial help.[1]

Tradition is still more specific in its treatment of this list of heretics. We are told that once more the list was presented to the king, when he was on the road to the south, before the battle of Solway, and that it was found in the pocket of his mantle after his death. It is highly improbable, however, that Beaton furnished such a list at a time when it was useless to the king; yet even if he had given it, it is still more improbable that he left it about the person of the king, when, by his

[1] Knox, Keith.

attendance on James's deathbed, he had the opportunity of recovering the scroll. There is no authentic information to show that such a list was found on the person of the king at his death; but there is the direct assertion of the governor Arran that such a list existed, and that his own name appeared first upon it.[1]

The policy of coercion which we have traced was not carried out without the sanction of the law. In 1525 an Act of Parliament was passed against those who held the doctrines of Luther; and in 1535 this Act was ratified in Parliament, and a statute decreed against those who brought to Scotland or used any of the Lutheran books.[2] In Pitcairn's 'Criminal Trials,' under date January 10 and February 28, 1538-39, there are notices of individuals finding surety against their using books suspected to be heretical.[3]

On the 14th of March 1541 the king was present at a Parliament held at Edinburgh, in which severe measures were taken against the new faith. It was enacted that, under pain of death, no one should question the authority of the Pope; that no private conventions should be held for disputation on the Scriptures; that

[1] Sadler, i. p. 94. [2] Keith, i. p. 27. [3] Pitcairn, i. 216.

abjurers of heresy should not be admitted to any spiritual or temporal office; that those who refused to answer a summons for heresy should be accounted heretics; that informers on heretics should receive certain rewards.[1]

By these Acts the prelates hoped, but hoped in vain, to stay the progress of the new faith. In Scotland, as in other countries in early Christian times, persecution served not to extirpate but to multiply the faithful. During the sitting of the Parliament of March 1541 a Reform Act was passed with the aim of purifying the manners of the Church.[2] The king was no doubt sincere in his reforming policy, since he was alive to the neglect of worship, and to the ignorance and vices of the clergy, for which "the Kirk and kirkmen were slighted and contemned." He assured the ambassador of the English king that he would see to the reform of the ecclesiastical vices; but his power as a reformer was of the smallest, separate as he was from his nobles, and under the influence of the clergy who were to be reformed. We find prosecutions under the Act directed against heresy, but none under the Act directed against the ignorance and vices of the clergy.

[1] Keith, i. pp. 29-31. [2] Ibid., i. p. 29.

CHAPTER VII.

REFORMATION FROM ENGLAND.

Beaton's policy of persecution was in part a consequence of Henry VIII.'s plan of intrigue in Scottish affairs. Henry sought through the Scottish king to convert Scotland, not to Protestantism as known in Germany, but to the political religion which consisted of a denial of the Papal authority in the ecclesiastical affairs of Christendom, and of an assertion of the headship of kings over the spiritual affairs of their own kingdoms. Scotland, through her maritime business, was in touch with Germany and Denmark, and her traders, as carriers of Lutheran literature, were among the first missionaries of Protestantism. No doubt the heresy propagated through this channel was as dangerous to the interests of the ancient Church as the heresy which spread from Eng-

land; but the new faith imported from Germany had not behind it a force of arms, and did not therefore require a stern persecution to crush it. Henry, with his genius for intrigue, and his fanatical zeal for the faith which he himself had inaugurated, was an enemy whom the Church had reason to fear. His connection with James, his army of spies and diplomatists scattered over Scotland, his military power, all threatened continual danger to the liberty and religion of Scotland; and if his plan of conversion failed, it was because of Beaton's persecution and astute diplomacy, and because the author of the plan was the King of England, the hereditary enemy of Scotland. Henry's policy in Scotland was twofold—to establish the English overlordship, and to join Scotland with England in the denial of the Papal supremacy, and in the opposition to a great Catholic League then in course of formation. On Beaton depended the success or the failure of Henry's policy. James's marriage, it has already been seen, was of special interest to the Pope, the Emperor, and the Kings of France and England, inasmuch as the marriage was likely to influence or determine his answer to the great religious question of the

time. The Emperor sent him the order of the Golden Fleece, and sought his alliance in securing a Catholic council. Francis sent him the order of St Michael; while the Pope sent him a consecrated cap and sword, that the sword "might breed a terror in the heart of a neighbouring prince," and besought him to defend the Catholic faith.[1] Thus was Scotland brought into the arena of European politics because of her proximity to England.

Shortly after the peace of 1534, Henry sent Lord William Howard to Scotland with instructions to make offer of the Garter to the king, to propose a meeting of the two sovereigns with Francis, and to promise on Henry's part the payment of all expenses incurred by James at the meeting. The Scottish king accepted the Garter, as well as the invitation to the meeting of the sovereigns; but this meeting did not take place.[2] In October 1535, Barlow and Holcrofte were sent from England with directions to persuade the King of Scotland of the excellence of his uncle's new creed. According to their instructions, these ambassadors were to

[1] Buchanan, Calderwood, Drummond.

[2] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. p. 1; Hamilton Papers, i. 14, 15.

endeavour to rouse James to anger against the authority of the Pope, and against the wealth and the power of the clergy. Moreover, the meeting of the two kings was again to be urged.[1] The reply of James was brief. He would keep his "obediens till Haly Kyrk," but he was willing to meet his uncle, and to leave to him the necessary arrangements.[2] In this same year, as has been shown, James despatched commissioners to arrange a marriage with Mary of Vendome, while Henry endeavoured to prevent the marriage and to draw James to his side in the great religious strife. Once more ambassadors were sent to Scotland;[3] and their instructions reveal Henry's character and his purposes towards Scotland. The ambassadors, Lord Howard and Barlow, bishop-elect of St Asaph, were to set before James the blessings of religion as then known in England, to suggest the demolition of the Scottish religious houses, but to make the suggestion in such a way as not to drive James for advice to his clerical council. Further, they were to obtain the opinions of the Scottish nobles regarding the ecclesiastical changes in England, and were to hint at the possible advantage to be gained

[1] Hamilton Papers, i. 22, 23, 26. [2] Ibid. [3] Ibid.

for them by the destruction of the monasteries. Margaret was to be persuaded that the meeting of the kings would further her private interests, and that Henry devised the meeting for no other purpose than to see "her and his dearest nephew." This meeting was to be arranged at a place "as fer within Englande as they canne;" and the Vendome marriage was to be delayed, if possible, on the plea that Henry would arrange for security for payment of the bride's dower.

Buchanan, in his account of this embassy, says that Barlow brought with him certain controversial books touching the Reformation, which James handed to his clerical advisers. These advisers pronounced the books heretical, and Barlow's missionary zeal was expended in vain, seeing that he had to deal not with James, but with men whom he styled "the Pope's pestylent creatures, very lymmes of the Devyll."[1] In spite of the opposition of the prelates and of some of the leading nobles, James favoured, or pretended to favour, the proposed meeting, and named Newcastle as the place and Michaelmas as the date.[2] Drummond asserts that Lord

[1] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. p. 37.

[2] Hamilton Papers, i. 28-31; State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. pp. 40-45.

Howard would not agree to Newcastle, and that with threats he sought to induce the Scottish council to decide on York. With strange perverseness, however, the ambassador showed himself on friendly terms with Sir George Douglas, and thus alienated the favour of James from Henry's proposals. The meeting did not take place, either at York or Newcastle, and for a time Henry's intrigues in this direction were baffled. A show of success, however, attended his efforts at reformation in Scotland. James wrote to him in May 1536, that he had sent to Rome for special powers to reform abuses in the realm, especially in reference to the temporal possessions of the Church.[1] James may have sought such powers, but it is certain that he did nothing to reform the abuses.

The clergy were the chief opponents of Henry's plans, and so strong was their opposition that at last they persuaded James to solicit from Rome a brief prohibiting the meeting. They urged that no trust was to be placed in Henry's promises, and pointed to his anxiety for the meeting to be held at York, or some spot "fer within Englande."

[1] Hamilton Papers, i. 33.

Moreover, these guardians of the national religion were not willing that their king should confer with the arch-heretic of England; and Buchanan relates how they brought to court the Archbishop of St Andrews and the Bishop of Dunkeld, infirm old men, to weep over the religion which Henry was seeking to destroy; and how they bribed the courtiers to warn James against his uncle's intrigues. For the failure of the Vendome marriage Henry was not responsible. On the contrary, the marriage with Magdalen was even less to his liking; and he declared to his sister that he knew nothing of his nephew's doings in France till he received the announcement of James's union with the daughter of Francis.[1] Henry, moreover, estranged still further his nephew's affections by not granting the request that he and his bride should be allowed to pass through England, on their journey from France to Scotland.[2]

The clergy had rescued James from Henry's influence; and now the union with France, so effectively promoted by Beaton, cemented once more the ancient Scoto-French alliance, and

[1] Hamilton Papers, i. 35.

[2] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. p. 69.

was likely to make Scotland an active agent in the advancement of the great Catholic cause.

During the absence of the Scottish king, on the occasion of his marriage, the government was carried on by a council of regency, of which the aged Archbishop of St Andrews was a member. Henry, though he had failed to procure the meeting at York and to prevent the French marriage, did not, even in the absence of his nephew, abate his zeal in pursuit of the Scottish policy.

Early in the year 1537, Sadler was sent to Scotland, nominally on a mission of inquiry regarding Margaret's domestic concerns, in reality on a mission of intrigue. He was instructed to ingratiate himself with the nobility, to gain Margaret as an agent of England, and to ascertain the feelings of the people in regard to the religious changes in England. Sadler had to report, however, that he found the council of regency in favour of the ancient religion, and inclined to war in its support.[1] Ray, who followed Sadler as Henry's spy, wrote on April 14, 1537, that it was universally reported in Scotland that the English had sent out ships to capture James on his homeward

[1] Sadler's letter, quoted in Pinkerton, ii. 343.

journey;[1] that it was believed that Henry and the Emperor were joined together against France, and that in consequence of this belief the Scots were ready to support France. Ray gave as his own opinion, that the Scots were more inclined to war than to peace with England, and he told how the Scots called the English heretics, "and other diverse sclawnderouse wordes." At a later date it was further reported that an order for armour to the people had been made by the council.[2] The rumours of war were increased on James's return to Scotland, and many signs indicated that he was preparing to attack Henry in case of a rupture between France and England.[3] During his journey he was even heard to say that "yf he lyved on yere he should hymself breake a spear on one Inglishman's breaste."[4] Thus was James joined in sympathy with France, and his country was with him; everywhere Henry's Scottish policy was marked with failure.

The marriage of James, after the death of Magdalen, with Mary of Guise, bound him still more closely than even his marriage with the

[1] Hamilton Papers, i. 41; State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. p. 78.

[2] Conf. Pinkerton, ii. 344.

[3] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. p. 94.

[4] Ibid., p. 80.

daughter of the King of France had done to the interests of the Catholic cause, and served to make wider the breach between the kings of Scotland and England.

Mary of Guise, and with her the Cardinal, arrived in Scotland in June 1538; but Beaton appears to have gone back shortly afterwards to France. The precise object of the visit to France is unknown, but in the interval important changes took place in the progress of the Pope's scheme of a Catholic league against England. Pope Paul acted as mediator between Charles and Francis, both exhausted with their campaigns; and as a result of the mediation the truce of Nice was signed on June 18, 1538.[1] After the signing of the truce, Paul published the Bull of excommunication against Henry, in the hope that the Emperor and the King of France would be moved to arms against the heretic.

Cardinal Pole, Englishman though he was, acted as the chief agent of the Pope in trying to form the league, and in the course of the negotiations proceeded to Spain to persuade Charles that, as a faithful son of the Church, he must leave for the time the punishment of the

[1] Robertson's Hist. of Charles V., Bk. vi.

Turk, and turn to the chastisement of Henry, now the most dangerous enemy to the Catholic Church. In the dispatch borne by Cardinal Pole, the Pope assured Charles that in an attack on England he would have the assistance of James of Scotland, and his excellent Cardinal, David Beaton.[1] The assurance given by the Pope, and Beaton's absence from Scotland in the autumn of 1538, show that the Cardinal was one of the chief promoters of the scheme of a Catholic alliance, by which he hoped to destroy Henry, the foe of the Papal authority, the disturber of the established religion, and the hereditary and energetic enemy of the liberties of Scotland. Hopeful of the success of the league, Beaton returned to Scotland to wage war on the heretics; and in the spring of 1539 the persecutions in Edinburgh and Glasgow took place.

Pole was so far successful in his mission to Charles. Early in the year 1539, English ships were arrested in Flanders; the Spanish ambassador was recalled from England, and a fleet began to collect at Antwerp and other ports.[2] The destination of the fleet was never known, but rumour had it that an attack on England

[1] Conf. Froude's History, ch. xv. [2] Ibid.

was intended. Among the communications to Henry from his agents was one to the effect that, on January 22, an ambassador of France had arrived in Scotland and passed to the king; another, that Francis had desired James to have an army ready on the 15th of May; and still another, that Beaton had gone to Paris to learn what the King of France and the Pope would do to help Scotland, and, if war were made on England, what was to be done for Scotland should the expedition fail.[1] In April, Ray, Henry's spy, reported that in Scotland there were evident preparations for war, and that Margaret had told him of the arrival from France of a large quantity of silver which was coined into money.[2] Evidently, however, the plan of campaign could not be determined, or there was reason for belief that any attack on England would prove a failure. In March, the wharves of Antwerp were covered with military stores for the expedition; on the 7th of April, news reached England that the fleet was broken up.[3]

Sometime during the spring of this year,

[1] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. pp. 147, 154, 156.
[2] Hamilton Papers, i. 52.
[3] Conf. Froude's History, ch. xv.

while the attack on England was still threatened, Henry sent Sadler to persuade James against the league, to warn him against the schemes of the Pope, and to suggest a meeting of the uncle and the nephew, if James's clergy would permit the meeting.[1] Nothing is known of the details of Sadler's mission, as there is no document bearing on the subject, save the letter of instructions. Henry also sent Norfolk from York to Berwick, and thus convinced James and his associates that, if Scotland was to be the point of attack on England by the Catholic allies, Henry would not be unprepared for it. Wharton wrote to Norfolk that the whole realm of Scotland was in a marvellous fear lest he should make a hasty invasion of Scotland.[2] The breaking up of the Flanders fleet was, however, a satisfactory answer to Henry's messages and hints to the King of Scotland.

If Henry had now successfully opposed his Catholic foes in their plan of attack on England, he was still no further advanced in the accomplishment of his designs on Scotland.

[1] Conf. Froude's History, chapter xviii., regarding the date of this mission of Sadler.

[2] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. pp. 157, 160.

In the autumn of this year, 1539, Archbishop James Beaton died, and the Cardinal was left in sole possession of the see of St Andrews. Shortly after his elevation to the primacy, Beaton applied to the Pope to make Gibson, Dean of Restalrig, a bishop, in order that he might act as his suffragan.[1] Thus the Primate secured leisure for the political work which did not lie among the duties of his clerical office.

Beaton for some unknown reason continued for a time in France after this failure of the Catholic league; and after his return his movements were closely watched by the English spies, as if they expected some further development of the Catholic policy. From a dispatch of the council of the North to Cromwell,[2] it appears that certain Scottish letters, which by the foundering of a ship had come into the hands of the council, made known that the Cardinal proposed to journey to Rome in the Lent time of the following year, and that the Scots "intended some mystery" with some of their allies. What the object of this intended visit to Rome was cannot now be made out,

[1] Epp. Reg. Scot., ii. 64.

[2] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. p. 168, and note.

but certain letters of James to the Pope and to the Cardinal Ghuicci show that the Pope sought to delay Beaton's journey, and that James urged the Pope to reconsider the matter.[1] The only private business which was likely to take Beaton to Rome was his wish to obtain legatine powers in Scotland;[2] but probably his chief purpose in seeking the presence of the Pope was to instigate anew the attempt to establish the Catholic league.

The King of Scotland, ever after his return from France, was closely watched by Henry's spies, and was frequently the recipient of advice from an uncle skilled in kingcraft.

The character of James shows vacillations which explain not only the praise bestowed on him by Catholic writers, but also the fond regrets of Protestant historians over one who was almost persuaded to be a Reformer. James saved the brother and sister of Patrick Hamilton from martyrdom, but consented to the death of Straiton and Gourlay; he witnessed the burning of the men on the Castle Hill of Edinburgh, but was privy to the escape of George Buchanan from the castle of St Andrews.

[1] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. p. 168, note.
[2] Sadler, i. pp. 13-17.

Later in the year in which he witnessed the burning in Edinburgh, he and his queen were spectators at Linlithgow of an interlude, probably Lindsay's "Satire of the Three Estates," in which the vices of the clergy and the presumption of the prelates were satirised. On the occasion of the interlude the king is said to have called on the Archbishop of Glasgow and the bishops present to reform their lives, or he would send six of the proudest of them to his uncle of England. At the same time it was reported that James intended to expel all the clergy from the offices of his household and of the State.[1] If James ever had such an intention, it was the intention of a man with the wish but without the power to act,—with the desire to exercise an authority which instead was exercised over him.

Acting on this or on similar information, Henry sent Sadler on another of his embassies to Scotland.[2] The commission to Sadler is the first proof of Henry's determination to remove Beaton from the councils of the King of Scotland,—a determination steadily maintained till Henry brought about the murder of his enemy.

[1] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. p. 170.
[2] Sadler, i. p. 3.

Sadler was directed to make known secretly to James that certain private letters of the Cardinal had come into Henry's possession, and that God had sent them into his hands. He was not instructed, however, to say that the letters had been stolen from the Cardinal's messenger. It was further to be stated that the Cardinal, under pretence of serving the king, was labouring to bring into his own hand not only the spiritual but the temporal jurisdiction of the realm, and was devising how to get possession of the king's traitors, that as their judge he might deliver them. James was also to be addressed concerning his unkingly habit of "meddling with sheep" as a means of revenue, and was to be instructed in the more royal and dignified method of increasing wealth by seizing some of the houses and possessions of the monks, as his uncle in England had done. Further, James was to be shown the advantages of an alliance with Henry rather than with Francis and Charles; and lastly, Sadler was to demand the deliverance of one Dr Hilliard, who had fled from England, and had taken refuge with the Cardinal.

In due time, Sadler wrote a report of his

mission.[1] The Cardinal's letter, which had been seen by James and despatched with his consent, referred to Beaton's request to be appointed legate *a latere*, a matter about which James himself had written to the Pope. Beaton's supposed dealings with traitors were also easily explained. They were simple men, James told Sadler, and he himself made the Cardinal the minister both to commit and to deliver them. Thus Henry utterly failed to incriminate Beaton and to discredit him with James; and Sadler had to write that James excused the Cardinal in everything, and seemed loath to hear anything in his dispraise. Henry was not more successful regarding the demolition of the religious houses. James thanked him for the advice, but declared that it seemed to him against reason and God's law to put down abbeys and religious houses which had stood many years and had maintained God's service. And what need had he to take them, he said, when he could have anything he asked of them? "I am sure," he declared, "there is not an abbey in Scotland at this hour, but if we mister anything, we may have of them whatever we will desire." When Sadler urged the profligacy

[1] Sadler, i. p. 17.

of the monks as a reason for the destruction of the religious houses, James answered, "God forbid that if a few be not good, for them all the rest should be destroyed."

The contrast is marked between the two kings in their conduct in regard to the religious houses; and though the breaking up of the monasteries may now be applauded on moral and economic grounds, praise may none the less be given to the Scottish king, who withstood the temptation of enriching himself after the fashion of the King of England. James, no doubt under the influence of the clergy, refused to lay a sacrilegious hand on the monasteries, though the destruction of them would have brought him wealth. Henry, on the other hand, with his assertion of superiority over the clergy, levelled the English religious houses to the ground; and thereafter advised his nephew to do likewise in Scotland, that he might "establish his revenue thereby in such sort as to be able to live like a king and yet not meddle with sheep."

In the Sadler papers there is no further mention of Hilliard. Hilliard, however, was being entertained at St Andrews by the "Griete Cardinall," who evidently dictated James's

reply to the demand that Hilliard, a religious refugee, should be exchanged for one Rutherford, a thief and manslayer. James refused the exchange, on the ground that he "leaves kirkmen to be dealt with by their ordinaries by the law of Haly Kirk."[1]

Everywhere Beaton triumphed in his answer to Sadler's insinuations and demands, and once more Henry was thwarted. Sadler himself confessed that, as the noblemen were young, and wanting in agility of wit, gravity, learning, and experience, the king was forced to use the bishops and the clergy as his only ministers for the direction of things.[2] Sadler, at the same time, gave a strange instance of the power and tyranny of the clergy. A report was spread that he and his folks ate flesh, as heretics and Jews, at Lent, and therefore the Cardinal caused proclamation to be made, "that whosever should buy an egg or eat an egg within those dioceses, should forfeit no less than his body to the fire to be burned as a heretick, and all his goods confiscate to the king." Sadler, however, must have invented or coloured the story, since the Scottish historians are silent on this matter, even those who

[1] Hamilton Papers, i. 54.

[2] Sadler, i. p. 47.

would gladly have chronicled such an instance of tyranny.

In the summer of 1540, James prepared a fleet, the most finely equipped of any yet seen in Scotland, to proceed against the turbulent chiefs in the Northern Isles. Huntly, Arran, and other nobles, with the Cardinal, accompanied the king; and such was Beaton's wealth that he furnished, at his own cost, five hundred men for the expedition.[1] Maxwell, the admiral, was not appointed commander of this expedition;[2] and Beaton thus had his revenge for the offence which Maxwell committed against him in conducting Mary of Guise to Scotland. James had hardly returned from this voyage when the trouble with Sir James Hamilton took place,—a trouble which, for a time, estranged the Cardinal from the king. The estrangement, however, was only temporary, and soon Beaton regained his paramount influence in the State; and Scotland once more presented the spectacle of a priest-ruled realm.

In the Parliament of 1541, this rule was shown in the Acts passed in favour of the

[1] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. p. 180.
[2] Letter quoted by Pinkerton, ii. p. 362.

ancient faith, and of the supremacy of the Pope; while the Act passed for the reform of the clergy was one to which they were not likely to object, since they themselves were to be the administrators of the Act.

The State correspondence of this year shows that Henry zealously demanded that the religious refugees to Scotland should be considered as criminals, and under the articles of existing treaties should be given up as such to him.[1] The Scottish Government would not, however, yield, and in no instance was a religious refugee sent back. Henry's anger had also been roused by the fact that James was now being styled Defender of the Faith. The Pope had offered to confer the title on James, and thus to deprive Henry of it; but no Bull was issued, such as appeared when Henry received the title for opposing Luther.

After Sadler's arrival in Edinburgh in 1540, on a mission of which little is known, he had sent to England certain books published in Scotland. On the title-page of one of these, 'The Trumpet of Honour,' the King of Scotland was called Defender of the Christian Faith, as if to show that his faith was not that of

[1] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. p. 191.

Henry.[1] Henry's wrath was thus swollen from many sources, but he resolved to make one more effort to see his nephew, and save him and his country from Rome. Beaton's absence from Scotland seemed to favour the prospect of a meeting. Henry set out on the 1st of July to visit the northern part of his kingdom, and arrived at Pomfret at the end of August. Here a messenger from the King of Scotland came to arrange a meeting between the two kings, before Henry's return to London.[2] James had commissioned Bellenden to visit Henry in reference to peace between the two countries,[3] and probably this was the messenger who at Pomfret proposed the meeting. Did the proposal originate with James? Kirkaldy of Grange, one of the Scottish-English faction, on advices from England had proposed to James to have this meeting, and had done so secretly, in order that Beaton's friends might hear nothing of it.[4] Apparently, then, the proposal originated with James; and though Henry suggested London, Windsor, or Hampton Court, as he could not go to York "without hurt of his

[1] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. p. 191.
[2] State Papers, i. 680.
[3] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. p. 190.
[4] Conf. Froude's History, ch. xix.

person,"[1] he finally did go to York in the middle of September, expecting there to meet James, who however did not appear. Immediately before the secret negotiations, Beaton, with David Panton, the secretary, had left Scotland for France and Rome, probably on the mission which had been postponed by the Pope.[2]

In June of this year, Ray, the spy of Henry, reported that every man in Scotland, according to his degree, was ordered to be ready with his equipments for war, and that in the castle of Edinburgh workmen were busy making guns and ammunition. On July 12, Sir William Eure reported that a ship with guns and pikes and other weapons had arrived from France.[3]

Probably there was some connection between the Cardinal's journey to France and those warlike preparations; and Henry, evidently suspecting that the Cardinal was planning a war on England, was anxious to meet James at York in September. In September it was reported that James, who was making no pre-

[1] Conf. Stevenson's Mary Stuart, p. 20.
[2] Hamilton Papers, i. 73; Epp. Reg. Scot., 121, 122, 136.
[3] Hamilton Papers, i. 70, 73.

paration to meet his uncle, had promised, before the Cardinal left for France, that he would not go to England without further word from him, and that on this date no further word had come from France; and further, it was reported that the council were opposed to the meeting. Though he knew these things, Henry proceeded to York on the 20th September, but, as already said, only to find that James did not appear.[1]

The failure of James to attend this meeting is usually alleged as the cause of the anger of the English king which preceded the rout of Solway; yet Henry, writing to James on the 26th of September, did not mention the meeting, nor blame James for not proceeding to York. On the other hand, there is evidence from a letter, of date 21st September, that James had appointed commissioners to meet Henry concerning the Border disputes; and the supreme political authority of Beaton is indicated by the fact that the commissioners delayed their departure to England till they had heard from Beaton, who was in France.[2]

On December 3, Wharton wrote that the commissioners were to leave Edinburgh on

[1] Hamilton Papers, i. 85, 90, 106. [2] Ibid., 88, 90.

December 1, and that the blame of James's non-appearance at York would be laid on the clergy, who feared an invasion from Henry when he was in the north, and who had been instructed by the Cardinal that the King of France did not favour a meeting between Henry and James.[1]

The commissioners eventually proposed a meeting at York on January 15, 1542, and promised that they would remain as hostages for the appearance of James. From Henry's reply to the proposal it is plain that some stipulation had been made by James that the consent of the King of France should first be obtained, and that, failing this consent, James would then endeavour to arrange a meeting of the three kings. Nothing came of the proposal for the meeting on January 15th; and thus Beaton finally triumphed in his endeavour to prevent the coming together of James and the man whom the Scottish clergy dreaded and hated.[2] The Scottish clergy had indeed reason to fear that Henry might persuade James to follow his example in throwing off the Papal authority, and in destroying the religious houses;

[1] Hamilton Papers, i. 106.

[2] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. pp. 198-200.

and moreover, they mistrusted the honesty of Henry's proposals as to a safe-conduct for James, who, they believed, would be detained a prisoner in England if he did not agree to Henry's terms.

Possibly the Scottish council did not know, but only suspected, Henry's sinister purposes. That the purposes were sinister, in spite of the professions of friendship and love from an uncle to a nephew, is seen from the plot for kidnapping James, to which Henry gave heed. Wharton seems to have proposed to Henry a scheme for capturing James, which Henry submitted to his council, who very explicitly condemned it.[1]

Henry's policy in Scotland failed, though he had the strength of English arms and the power of English gold to help him. He was matched by a man as able as himself, who in opposition to powerful influences had saved for a time the ancient Church and the ancient liberties of Scotland. The Cardinal and the Earls of Murray and Argyle were named as the chief of those who prevented the Scottish king's journey to York,[2] though Beaton afterwards argued to Sadler that, seeing he was in France at the date

[1] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. p. 204. [2] Ibid., p. 214.

of the proposed meeting, he was not responsible for James's failure to attend. It has been shown, however, that James would not go to England without the Cardinal's consent, and that consent was not obtained. In the interests of the Church and of the State, Beaton surely acted wisely when he refused his consent to the meeting at York. According to Knox, the prelates and churchmen promised to James "mountains of gold (as Satan their father did to Christ Jesus if He would worship him); for rather would they have gone to hell than he should have met King Henry; for then, thought they, farewell our kingdom of abbots, monks, &c. And farewell, thought the Cardinal, his credit and glory in France." We may praise or blame the motives of Beaton and the prelates, but they successfully frustrated the policy of England.

CHAPTER VIII.

SOLWAY MOSS AND ITS SEQUEL.

On the 14th of August 1542, it was reported to the Privy Council of England that the Cardinal, though English ships had been watching for him in the Channel, had returned from France, and had been well received by James.[1] Beaton failed in his mission to France and Rome, if the mission had for its object the arrangement of a war against England, such as that projected in the year 1539. By the peace of Nice, Francis and Charles had been joined in friendly alliance, the French king having received from the Pope some kind of promise of the coveted Duchy of Milan. The promise, however, was not fulfilled, and once more, in the shifting scenery of European politics, Francis and Charles were at enmity. In the year 1541, the Turk defeated

[1] Hamilton Papers, i. 119.

the army which the Emperor had sent under his brother Ferdinand to save Hungary. In October of the same year Charles sailed to Algiers, the headquarters of the Sultan's fleet, with twenty thousand infantry and two thousand horse; but he was vanquished, and by December was back again in Spain.

Charles now thought of a league with Henry, although the heretical King of England was no meet ally for his Catholic majesty. Yet Francis feared this alliance; and, determining therefore to set Scotland against England, he opposed, after the Spanish loss of Hungary, and again after the defeat at Algiers, the meeting of Henry and James at York. Francis also attempted another stroke of policy. To induce Henry to join him in war against Charles, he proposed a marriage between the Duke of Orleans and the Princess Mary, and made offer to Henry of certain towns round Calais.[1] In the summer of 1542, however, this alliance was no longer mooted; but, on the contrary, it was rumoured that Charles had married the Princess Mary, and had entered into league with Henry. Now the talk in France was of war against Charles and Henry; and the Arch-

[1] Conf. Froude's History, ch. xix.

bishop of Paris hinted, in Beaton's presence, to Paget, the English ambassador, that the French would send the Scots, the Danes, and the Swedes to eat up all the Englishmen in four days. "Englishmen be not easy morsels to swallow," replied Paget.[1] In a later despatch the ambassador wrote that the French counted that if "Henry made any business with France, the Scottish king would straight molest him."[2]

In July hostilities between Francis and Charles broke out, and Charles once more, especially as the Pope favoured his rival, opened negotiations with Henry. In September Francis raised the siege of Perpignan, and left Alva victor; but his hopes were revived when, in October, the Turk was successful in Hungary over the army of Ferdinand, which included a party of English soldiers. A league between Henry and Charles would be fatal to Francis, and Scotland, he determined, should be used to occupy Henry's attentions. Beaton, accordingly, returned to Scotland, probably in July of this year, 1542; and, though disappointed in the scheme of the Catholic league, resolved to strike a blow which might save the religion of Scotland, help France

[1] State Papers, ix. p. 75. [2] Ibid., p. 106.

in her quarrel with Spain, and perhaps, if a rising of the Catholics in the north and other parts of England took place, deliver England from the rule of the heretic.

Affairs in England and Scotland were also ripening for war. James was angry because Henry, by adopting the title of King of Ireland, instead of the former designation of Lord of the Country, had swept aside the claim of interest which the Scottish king had had in Ireland from the time of Edward Bruce. Henry, on the other hand, was jealous of James because of the latter's adoption of the title of Defender of the Christian Faith, though this jealousy was not specifically mentioned by Henry among the causes of the declaration of war. In August 1542, the disturbances on the Borders gave occasion to Sir Robert Bowes to cross into Scotland in order to punish some of the troublesome Borderers. Bowes, though he had three thousand men, fell into the hands of a body of Scots headed by Huntly; and at Haddonrig he and six hundred of his following were taken prisoners.[1] James immediately sent word of this engagement to France, where it was exaggerated into a great victory, and at the same time

[1] Hamilton Papers, i. 127, 128, 146.

wrote to Henry regarding negotiations for peace. Henry in return sent a safe-conduct for James's ambassadors, and wrote expressing willingness to conclude a peace. James answered, and the answer indicated a wavering policy, that he had just learnt that Henry blamed Huntly for the fray at Haddonrig, and that now he sent evidence to prove that the fray was due to Bowes.[1] James desired war, but feared the result on account of the disloyalty of his nobles; and therefore for a time the peace negotiations were continued. In September, commissioners representing the two countries met at York; but while the usual proposal for a meeting of the sovereigns was made, nothing was done to prevent the outbreak of war.[2] Norfolk accordingly with the English army advanced into Scotland; and Henry published his manifesto declaring the causes of the war, and setting forth his claims to the overlordship of Scotland. This manifesto, prepared by the Archbishop of York, travels back into the kingdom of fable. Brutus had three sons; one ruled in Scotland, and one in Wales, and these acknowledged the superiority of Locrine, who ruled in England. Instances are gathered from fic-

[1] Hamilton Papers, i. 131, 141, 142. [2] Ibid., 167, 175, 181.

tion and history of kings of Scotland paying homage to England. The last instance specified is that of James I., who at Windsor admitted the authority of Henry VI.[1] The reasons for the war were declared to be the harbouring of English criminals by the Scots, the invasion of English territory by certain Scots during negotiations for peace between the two kings, the refusal to yield to Henry lands to which he had proved his title, and, lastly, the failure of James to keep the appointment at York.

Norfolk crossed the Tweed and destroyed Kelso, while another of the English commanders devastated the surrounding country. It was now winter, and as stores were scanty, Norfolk, after reaching Howtle, returned to England with a multitude of his soldiers. He wrote that James would gladly have had peace, but was prevented from suing for it by his council. Some confirmation is given to Norfolk's assertion by Bishop Lesley, who expressly declares that James sent ambassadors to arrange a peace with the English commander.[2]

[1] Holinshed and Hall.

[2] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. p. 221 ; Hamilton Papers, i. p. lxxiii.

James, especially by favour shown to the clergy, had alienated the loyalty of many of his nobles, and had driven them to Henry's side in the religious struggle. The most ardent Scottish patriot could not eulogise those nobles. Yet this quarrel with England, it must be admitted, was not their concern, and did not touch their interests; it was the quarrel of Beaton and the churchmen with Henry, and therefore the Scottish nobles rebelled against their king. When Norfolk returned to England, there was an opportunity for the Scots to invade England, and James therefore mustered the Scottish forces on Fala Moor,[1] but the nobles refused to join in the war. They declared their feudal allegiance compelled them to defend their country, not to march out of it against an enemy. To England they would not go; and James, after soundly rating them for disloyalty, returned to Edinburgh. We are indebted to Knox for an account of what thereafter happened. The Cardinal urged James to pursue the campaign, and drawing up a list of heretics, presented it to him. James, on a former occasion, had refused such a list, but now he was willing to accept it, if the clergy

[1] Buchanan and Lesley.

would supply him with the means for making war. A meeting was accordingly ordered to be held at Lochmaben on the 24th November, and ten thousand men gathered in reply to the order. The English were at Berwick, and the plan was that the Scots should march into Cumberland and, if possible, take Carlisle. Beaton and the Earl of Arran, in order to draw off attention from the main body of the Scots, were to proceed to Haddington, and to make a show of attack on the east border. The Scots accordingly crossed into Cumberland, where, as the king did not accompany them, Oliver Sinclair, a minion of the king, and a tool of the Cardinal, was proclaimed leader. The Scots were not the men, however, to submit to this indignity, and Oliver Sinclair, they determined, should not lead them. Amidst their confusion they were attacked by the Cumberland farmers, and a cry was raised that Norfolk was advancing. Soon the army was disordered and fled, though no Norfolk was upon them. The main portion reached the Solway Moss, and fell into the hands of Wharton; and one important result of the battle was the capture of some of the Scottish nobles who had obeyed their king's

call to arms, and who were now sent prisoners to Henry. In the dispatches to Henry the number of the Scots was variously estimated at fourteen, seventeen, and eighteen thousand; and the number of English at two and three thousand. Whatever the exact numbers may have been, Solway was a rout.[1]

Knox's story of the list of heretics, as has been previously shown, is of doubtful accuracy. It is not probable that such a list would be prepared at the time stated, seeing that it could in no way affect the result of the battle. No doubt Beaton favoured the spoiling of the heretics; and had the Scots been victorious in the war, this persecution would probably have been carried out. Drummond asserts that the nobles intended a reformation of the court, for the purpose of evicting those who were styled "the pensioners of the clergy"; and on the supposition that this assertion is true, it is evident that the Cardinal, if he actually prepared the list, determined to destroy those reformers of the court. At the same time, Knox's main contention, that the Cardinal was the adviser of the war, is borne out by the evidence of Hertford that the king was advised to the war by

[1] Hamilton Papers, i. 240-247, p. lxxiii.

the Cardinal, Maxwell, Oliver Sinclair, and Mark Carre. His account, too, of Beaton's share in the battle, has been authenticated. Hertford's reports show that the Cardinal had been at Peebles and then at Haddington with the Earl of Murray, immediately before the day of the Solway rout; while Angus informed Hertford that, had the Scots been victorious in the war, it was the intention of Beaton and Murray to proceed from Haddington to England, and there in one of the churches to proclaim, in name of the Bishop of Rome, sentence of interdict upon the realm.[1]

After the battle James hurried to an interview with the Cardinal at Edinburgh, and it may well be believed that that interview was unpleasant. There was further news, too, to disturb the king. Henry had sent Somerset herald on a mission to him, and the night on which the Scots set out for the south the herald was dismissed. James now learned that he had been murdered on the road to Dunbar by two English refugees, one of whom was known to be on friendly terms with Beaton. The herald had been detained lest he should report the doings of the Scots; and the English suspected that the murder was arranged, and

[1] Hamilton Papers, i. 245, pp. lxxxii, lxxxiii, xc, xci.

that Beaton was privy to it. The suspicion seems, however, to have been groundless; and James endeavoured to heal the wounded honour of the English king by imprisoning the murderers, who were afterwards sent to England.[1] James left Edinburgh and reached Falkland, after visiting the house of the Laird of Grange. At Falkland, where he was prostrated with a sudden and, as it proved, a fatal sickness, word was brought to him that the queen had borne a daughter, and he replied in the now well-known words, "It came with a lass, and it will pass with a lass." "And so he recommended himself," says Lindsay, "to the mercy of Almighty God, and spake little from that time forth, but turned his back unto his lords, and his face unto the wall." The Cardinal's friends, it was reported, left the body of the king unburied, in the hope that Francis, ignorant of the death, might send money as to the king. The rumour was unfounded, and the remains of the king were carried with funeral pomp to Holyrood, and placed beside those of the queen Magdalen. Among those in attendance were the Cardinal, with the Earls of Arran and Argyle, and other nobles.[2]

[1] Hamilton Papers, i. 242, 257, 264-267, p. lxxvi.
[2] Ibid., i. 273; Lesley, Drummond.

When James lay dying there were around him the Cardinal, the Earls of Argyle and Rothes, the Lords Erskine and Lindsay, Sir David Lindsay, the Laird of Grange, Andrew Wood, and Norman Leslie.[1] Some of these men were bitterly opposed to Beaton, and yet, according to certain of the early historians, he caused James to sign a will appointing him chief of a council of regency. Knox declares that Beaton hired a priest named Balfour to forge a will, which the king signed; and he mentions another report, that the dead hand of the king was made to sign a blank paper, on which Balfour afterwards wrote the will. Buchanan asserts that the Cardinal, with the help of Balfour, simply forged the will. No charge of forgery was ever preferred against Beaton, though Arran on one occasion informed Sadler that there was a crime for which he might prosecute the Cardinal. Arran, however, was the man whom Beaton sought to displace in the regency.[2]

Among the scandalous rumours of the time was one to the effect that James had died of

[1] Lindsay of Pitscottie.

[2] A document has recently been discovered among the Hamilton Papers which the editor of the Report on Hist. MSS. considers to be the original will.

poison at the hands of Beaton; but the story is manifestly untrue, as the king's death was a calamity to the schemes of the Cardinal.[1]

Knox relates that, James being dead, the Cardinal hastened to consult the Queen Dowager as to the government of the nation, and does not hesitate to suggest a scandalous relationship between them. Knox probably believed the scandal, but by the irony of fate others believed stories as groundless regarding himself.

On the 18th of December, Henry was informed that Arran and certain nobles were to be joined with Beaton as a council of regency, and that Beaton was to act as governor of the young queen and as chief of the council; and, a few days later, Henry learned that proclamation to this effect had been made in presence of the Cardinal. The nobles who were opposed to the clergy did not, however, quietly acquiesce in an arrangement which placed Beaton at the head of affairs. Arran, heir to the crown after the young queen, was by birth the person entitled to the honour of being governor, though Buchanan describes him "as generally believed to be but poorly qualified by the humbler

[1] Melville, Drummond; Hamilton Papers, i. 261-267.

virtues for conducting himself in private life, and as little fitted by courage or capacity for directing the government of a kingdom." A meeting of the nobles was accordingly called, at which Beaton objected to the government of one man, and especially of one man of the name of Hamilton. Arran, urging his just title, claimed that opposition should not be made to him till his rule had been tried. The courtesy of the times is evident from Arran's speech. He called the Cardinal "False Churle," and declared that what the Cardinal had reported in James's name was "all lyes."[1] Arran, as the result of the meeting, was proclaimed governor; and three days afterwards free pardons were granted to Beaton and the other lords engaged in the affair.[2] A free pardon to Beaton may seem to indicate a crime, but his opposition to the appointment of Arran suffices to account for the pardon.

Arran's name was on the list of proscribed persons said to be given to James, and therefore it may be supposed that he was friendly to the cause of the Reformation, and that his election to the governorship was favoured by

[1] Hamilton Papers, i. 261-267, 271-273.
[2] Keith's Hist., i. p. 64 note.

Henry. Arran, however, was weak of purpose and vacillating in policy; and though he represented a section of the nobles and of the people, he was opposed by Beaton and his party, which included the clergy, some of the leading nobles, and the majority of the people, who, if they did not favour the ancient Church with its doctrines and practices, were decided in their opposition to England.

The Douglases were still in England, as James had maintained his hatred of them till the day of his death. Now they might return at any time, and their presence in Scotland could not be without effect on the progress of events. Beaton, wishing to stand within their favour, and deeming it safer for the success of his policy that they should be in Scotland, spread the rumour that James on his deathbed commanded the Earl and his brother to be recalled, and to be restored to their lands, if they would do their duty to their country.[1]

Henry, however, had other purposes than merely to restore the Douglases to their country and their possessions. The prisoners taken at Solway had been conveyed to Lon-

[1] Hamilton Papers, i. 263-265.

don; but when Henry heard of James's death, a marked change was made in their treatment, and it was soon evident that he meant to use them for his own schemes in Scotland, and by favours to bind them to his interests. The publication of the Hamilton State Papers has now made clear the full extent of Henry's intrigues and purposes. On the 29th of December 1542 it was intimated to the council of Scotland that at the suit of the Earls of Cassilis and Glencairn, and others of the prisoners, Henry had consented, subject to certain pledges and hostages, to their return to Scotland.[1] These pledges were not stated, but we are not ignorant of their nature. The chief prisoners, among whom, besides the Earls of Cassilis and Glencairn, were the Lords Maxwell, Fleming, Somerville, Gray, and Oliver Sinclair, pledged themselves to secure that the young queen should be sent to England, on the pretext that she was to be affianced to Henry's son Edward; that certain castles and fortresses should be given to Henry, and the country governed in his name; that the Cardinal should be made prisoner and sent to England; and that the Protector, if he would not join them,

[1] Hamilton Papers, i. 266, 276.

should be similarly treated. They were also to see that persons bound to Henry's interest should at once be placed around the infant queen, and were to prevent any one from "any strange part" from coming to the government of the country, and were to warn Arran that the Cardinal would certainly plot with France. The Earls of Bothwell and Angus also agreed to these terms, and Henry explicitly instructed the prisoners to declare openly as their policy the deliverance of the young queen to England. The prisoners, moreover, were secretly required to sign a bond, as also was Angus, to the effect that in the event of the death of the young queen, who had been reported to Henry as being a sickly child, they would help Henry to take the crown and government of Scotland.[1] Never before had Henry so distinctly expressed his intentions; but now, in spite of former protestations of friendliness towards Scotland, and of his desire for peace, he committed to Angus and the English prisoners, as they were called, the design of seizing the crown of Scotland at the death of the infant queen. To such base uses had these Scottish nobles descended, that they agreed to betray

[1] Hamilton Papers, i. 275-277.

their country, even by aiding Henry's soldiers who might be sent to accomplish their master's plan. Sir George Douglas, the brother of Angus, did not hesitate in writing to call Henry his "Sovereign Lord," nor is there wanting the plainest proof that these English prisoners accepted Henry's gold as the price of their perfidy. In history there are few transactions more shameless than this; and yet those men, Henry and his minions of Scotland, were to be known as the champions of the reformed religion, and through corruption and betrayal the Reformation in Scotland was to be accomplished. Tradition is unjust. Men who were willing to sell their country's independence for gold have been awarded the praise given to religious reformers, and it is forgotten that Beaton, who has been justly condemned for opposing the reform of the Church, was the man who saved the liberties of his country.

Henry's plans for sending back the English prisoners were quickly matured. It was reported to him that the Cardinal had declared that Arran's son should wed the young queen; and again there was talk that she might be given to the second son of the King of France,

or of the King of Denmark, or of the King of England, if Henry had a second son.[1] Of more importance in Henry's eyes was the rumour that in Scotland men spoke of Arran as the future king, should Mary die.[2] With the infant Mary in his hands, and the Cardinal removed, Henry might see Scotland in subjection to England: the child dead, and Beaton and Arran disposed of, he might see himself king of Scotland as well as of England and Ireland.

In Scotland Beaton, aided by Mary of Guise, was at the head of those who opposed Henry's scheme of reformation and his policy of annexation; Arran, supported by a considerable body of the people, was friendly to the cause of the Reformation, and wrote to Henry of his intentions regarding the Church; but in view of his connection with the infant queen, and of his heirship to the crown, it is highly improbable that he ever countenanced the submission of his country. Now the state of parties in Scotland was to be complicated by the arrival of the English prisoners with Bothwell and the Douglases.

Arran, moreover, had not strength and courage and decision to guide the councils and

[1] Hamilton Papers, i. 268, 272, 275. [2] Ibid.

policies of his country; and for the next years, till Beaton's death, Scottish history is mainly the record of the opposing policies of Henry and Beaton.

The English prisoners arrived in Scotland on the 20th of January, and on the 26th Beaton was a prisoner in Dalkeith. Beaton had been in correspondence with the French, to whom he looked for help, and it was said that after Solway, and before the king's death, he was making ready to proceed to France, to solicit assistance against England. The rumour of this correspondence was made the foundation of a charge that he had invited the Duke of Guise to take the government of Scotland. On this charge Beaton was imprisoned, and though Arran afterwards professed not to believe the charge, the English acted as if it were true, and guarded the Channel against the coming of Guise.[1]

Before the arrival of Angus and his friends Beaton was supreme over Arran, as is witnessed by the fact that he induced the Earl to take the Chancellor's seal from the Archbishop of Glasgow, and to bestow it on him.[2] This

[1] Sadler, i. 138; Hamilton Papers, i. 283, 292, 295, 300, 304.
[2] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. p. 250.

supremacy made Beaton adverse to the restoration of Angus, though he had but a short time previously advocated it. By an intentional or unintentional act of Arran, who handed the wrong letter to him, Beaton first became aware that Henry had sinister designs against him in which Angus was involved.[1] The day following the incident of the letter, the Cardinal in council opposed the return of the Douglases, unless under guarantee of good faith. This opposition was supported by Argyle, Murray, Huntly, and others; but Arran overruled the proposal to require a guarantee, and pledged himself for the patriotism of the Earl. The same day, Beaton sought Sir George Douglas, and asked him his opinion of the state of religion. Douglas answered that he favoured a reformation such as that of England, whereat the Cardinal sighed, though he assured him that there would be no enmity between them, and that he had twenty thousand crowns which would be at his command. Beaton left him, and proceeded to the governor to warn him against the Douglases, while the governor in turn reported the matter to Sir G. Douglas, adding that the Cardinal was the "falsest karle

[1] Hamilton Papers, i. 285.

in the world," and, as instance, showed that the Cardinal had advised him to seek for a divorce that he might marry the queen-dowager. Sir George and the governor then agreed to seize the Cardinal on the arrival of Angus and send him to Henry; and Arran promised that he would reform the Scottish after the manner of the English Church. Lord Lisle, who had written to Arran concerning Guise, was able to report on the 21st of January that Beaton was a prisoner, and that the news regarding Guise had hastened Arran in this matter.

The seizure of the Cardinal caused a commotion in the palace of Edinburgh, where the queen-dowager lay. Mary was alarmed, but was pacified by the assurance that it was only the taking of a "false trumping karle." When Beaton was removed, his priest was seen to hurry after him with the Cardinal's cross, whereat Angus declared "he shall paye better than his cross err he have done." The Cardinal was taken to Dalkeith, then to Seton, afterwards to Blackness under the guard of Lord Seton, who, though a relative of the governor, was a supporter of the Cardinal. Thus for a time Beaton was deposed from his power over

the governor; and Angus and his brother ruling in the Cardinal's place, Henry's plans seemed to prosper. "Angus and his brother," wrote Lisle, "ruleth the rost about the governor."[1]

[1] Hamilton Papers, i. 285-289.

CHAPTER IX.

FURTHER INTRIGUES.

The imprisonment of Beaton did not advance the cause either of Arran or of the Douglases. It was sacrilege in the eyes of the clergy, who in anger closed the churches of the diocese of St Andrews, and refused to dispense the sacraments. The Earls of Argyle, Murray, and Huntly, friends of the Cardinal, demanded his release, and threatened force to obtain it; while Bothwell, though he did not join the party of those nobles, withdrew from Angus and went so far as to visit Beaton.[1]

Meanwhile, Henry urged that the prisoner should be sent to England; but Douglas replied that this was for the present impossible. Nor, it was declared, could the Scottish fortresses as

[1] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. pp. 249-252; Lesley, p. 171.

yet be given into Henry's keeping.[1] Henry was baffled: he could not get Beaton into England, and, in regard to the fortresses, he had to rest satisfied with the assurance that the "English lords" hoped soon to place Edinburgh and Dunbar, as already Tantallon was, under the charge of men of their own party.[2]

Beaton's friends, finding their remonstrances of no avail, separated until the meeting of Parliament. Attempts were made by Arran and Angus, but without success, to pacify the clergy; and a proposal was even made that some one should be temporarily appointed to the see of St Andrews, in order that the ecclesiastical work of the diocese might be resumed.[3]

Parliament was summoned to meet on the 12th of March 1543; but, before that day, the lords favourable to Beaton assembled at Perth and appointed commissioners to approach the governor and the Council, and to demand from them the release of the Cardinal, and the withdrawal of the order which made the use of the English Bible permissive. This demand was

[1] Hamilton Papers, i. 292-298, 301-303.
[2] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. p. 250.
[3] Hamilton Papers, i. 299.

made and refused; but the Catholic lords, notwithstanding, promised allegiance to Arran, lest they should be hindered from attending the meeting of Parliament.[1]

Henry, too, was busy before this meeting took place, as he hoped to prevent the ratification by Parliament of the appointment of Arran as governor. A rumour reached him that Arran was a prisoner in the hands of Beaton's friends, and he suspected, or pretended to suspect, that Arran was a party to his own imprisonment. The rumour was without foundation; yet, as it would have suited Henry's purposes to prove an intrigue between the governor and the Cardinal, he endeavoured to discover such an intrigue. One of Lord Lisle's household servants was employed as a spy on Arran's movements; but that spy discovered nothing which Henry could possibly use as a pretext for opposing the ratification of Arran's appointment.[2]

When Parliament met, Arran was formally recognised as governor of the realm; and as none of the "English lords" was bold enough to name Henry for the governorship, he was not long of finding an opportunity to upbraid

[1] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. p. 263; Sadler, i. pp. 67, 68.
[2] Hamilton Papers, i. 299, 336.

his pensioners for silently agreeing to the appointment of Arran.[1]

The "English lords" were not, however, false to their pledges, seeing that they laid before Parliament their master's proposals regarding the marriage of the infant queen. Parliament appointed commissioners to meet with Henry, and instructed them to agree to the marriage of Mary with his son, but to refuse consent to her removal from Scotland till she was of a marriageable age. They were further instructed to see that the independence of Scotland should suffer no detriment by the marriage, and that native rulers should always succeed to the crown. One concession was to be made to Henry. He was to be permitted to send an English gentleman and English ladies to attend on Mary, so long as she resided in her native land.[2]

Angus urged for better terms for his master, and is said to have pulled off his cap when he said "the kinges majestie my master, God save his grace"; but Angus only succeeded in securing a reversal of his own attainder.

The King of England, as if he were a Scot, did not know when he was beaten; and defeat

[1] Hamilton Papers, i. 299, 336. [2] Sadler, i. p. 59 *et seq.*

served only to show the fertility of his resources. He had published his claims to the overlordship of Scotland, and at Solway had emphasised them. The Scottish Parliament, however, would have none of him, and the manifesto was but an exercise in historical study. Arran was now governor, and Henry, while describing him as "occupying the place of governor," resolved with the aid of Sadler to instruct him in the arts of government. Sadler reported in his first letter, on information received from Sir George Douglas, that at some future time the governor and the nobles would be brought to love the king, and to yield to him the whole direction and obedience of the realm. This fancy was intended to prepare the way for the assurance, that were an attempt made to depose Arran, there would be riot in the land, the Cardinal would be liberated, and a French army imported. "There is not," wrote Sadler, "so little a boy but he will hurl stones against it, and the wives will handle their distaffs, and the commons universally will rather die in it."[1]

The people were certainly roused to anger, and Beaton's imprisonment they correctly as-

[1] Sadler, i. p. 70.

cribed to Arran acting under the influence of Angus, whom, in spite of his illustrious name, they detested for his disloyalty to his country. The people would yield nothing to England; the Cardinal must be liberated, the Church upheld, and the young queen be placed under the guardianship of Scottish nobles. Once more the cause of the new faith suffered by reason of Henry's lust of power. Beaton's imprisonment was undoubtedly due to the Douglases, and but for them the governor, moved by the popular clamour, would have liberated him. Yet they determined that Beaton should not be set at liberty, and that Arran's jealousy should be roused. Sadler therefore insinuated that the Cardinal, if free, would usurp the chief power, and would not only seek Arran's destruction, but would make the realm subservient to France. It was an easy task to rouse the jealousy of Arran, who swore "he shall never come out of prison whilst I may have mine own will."[1]

Sadler, after his success with the governor, passed to Mary of Guise; but, experienced as he was, he had not yet met a woman so skilled in the lying arts of diplomacy. Mary professed

[1] Sadler, i. p. 77.

to feel honoured by Henry's proposals, to be agreeable to the English marriage, and to the immediate delivery of the child into England. With feminine love of romance, and of a secret and its disclosure, she confidentially informed Sadler that the governor intended to agree to the English marriage, but to retain the child in Scotland till she was of a marriageable age, in the hope that Henry would then be dead, and the treaty be rendered of no effect. His real motive, she declared, was ultimately to marry the queen to his own son; and she warned Sadler that nothing would ever come of the English marriage, unless Henry insisted on immediately obtaining custody of the child. As one guileless of the arts of diplomacy, she suggested "the Cardinal, if he was at liberty, might do much good in the same." Sadler thought that Beaton would not do much good in the same, but Mary protested that "the Cardinal was a wise man, and could better consider the benefit of the realm than all the rest."

She warned Sadler, moreover, that she would in future seem to oppose the marriage, in order that the governor might further reveal to her his purposes.[1]

[1] Sadler, i. p. 85 *et seq.*

Arran's purposes were not those ascribed to him by the queen-dowager. In his jealousy of Beaton he was willing to reform the Church, to permit the reading of the Bible, to throw off allegiance to the Pope, and to agree to the English marriage. That marriage would be fatal to his hopes for his son; but such was his jealousy of the Cardinal, that he gave his consent to certain schemes, simply because they were opposed by Beaton.

Bothwell and Buccleuch, at this time, each offered to deliver the child to Henry; but seeing they were of Beaton's party, it is evident that the offer was made at the Cardinal's suggestion, who was desirous of learning Henry's intentions.[1]

Sadler would not yield consent to the release of the Cardinal, yet the release was at hand. For some unknown reason the governor and the Douglases resolved to remove Beaton from Blackness, which was a strong fortress, to the castle of St Andrews, which belonged to their prisoner. Arran pretended that this arrangement would give him possession of a desirable castle, and would cause the clergy to believe that the Cardinal was at liberty, and, in consequence, to perform mass at Easter; while Sir

[1] Hamilton Papers, i. 305, 318.

George Douglas declared that after the castle of St Andrews had been gained, Beaton would be removed to Tantallon or Dunbar. Douglas further asserted that he had spoken to the Cardinal regarding his removal to St Andrews, and that he was "a wily carle, and would not consent to the matter." In spite of a protest from Sadler, made to the Douglases in Henry's name, Beaton, under the charge of Lord Seton, with some twelve or sixteen servants, passed to St Andrews, which was garrisoned by 300 of his own retainers. Beaton, while nominally a prisoner, was in reality free, and yet Arran had sworn not to liberate him. Arran afterwards sought to blame Lord Seton for this strange affair; but obviously the blame, were there any, was entirely his own. The threats of the Catholic lords may have influenced him; perhaps his brother Hamilton, the Abbot of Paisley, who had just come from France, may have persuaded him; possibly the rumoured arrival of Lennox in Scotland may have suggested the desirability of a friendly alliance with the Cardinal. Amidst these conjectures may be found Arran's motive for consenting to the release of Beaton.[1]

[1] Hamilton Papers, i. 340; Sadler, i. pp. 89, 103, 117, 136 *et seq.*

Undoubtedly the rumour that Lennox was on his way to Scotland inspired the governor with alarm. Arran's father had divorced his wife, and during her lifetime had married again. Of this second marriage Arran, the future governor, was born, and his legitimacy therefore depended on the validity of the divorce. Were the Pope's authority questioned, Arran's legitimacy would also be questioned, and his claim to the Scottish throne endangered. After Arran, Lennox was heir to the crown, and there was no dispute as to his direct descent from King James II.

Lennox, it was rumoured, was on his way to Scotland in order to marry the queen-dowager, and this rumour was used to induce Arran to attach himself to the English party. Lennox arrived in Scotland in April, but before that date the Cardinal was removed to St Andrews. In consideration of the fact that Lennox left France with the consent of the king of that country, it may be accepted that he came to Scotland after invitation from Beaton and the queen-dowager, and that by using him they succeeded where Henry failed in gaining the governor.[1]

[1] Hamilton Papers, i. 295, 336, 350.

Beaton was now free, but Arran protested that he was in close and safe confinement; and when Sadler thereupon demanded that the prisoner should be sent to England, the governor laughingly refused, lest it should be thought, he said, that they in Scotland were not able to punish faults. The Cardinal, he added, "had lever go into hell" than go to England. The Cardinal's feelings, however, were consulted, and he was not sent to England; but it would be strange indeed had any one been deceived by Arran's conduct.[1]

A policy of deception was systematically followed in regard to Henry. It was pretended that Beaton was a prisoner in St Andrews, and Beaton invited Sadler to that place, that through him he might offer his lawful service to the king's majesty. Mary of Guise also pursued the same policy, and maintained that had the Cardinal been free, he would not only have furthered the English marriage, but would himself have gone to England to offer his services to Henry. Beaton even declared that though he had interests in France, he now saw the good of a union between Scotland and England, and saving always the freedom

[1] Sadler, i. p. 104 *et seq.*

of Scotland, would work to accomplish this union.[1]

Henry was not likely to be deceived by these protestations, but he resolved, if possible, to profit by them. Sadler was accordingly instructed to meet the Cardinal, and, by way of showing the advantages of a Scoto-English alliance, was to offer him, if he would renounce the interests of France, a bishopric in England richer than that of Mirepoix.[2]

The most honest man of the time, in spite of his incapacity to govern, was Arran; and yet he was guilty of deception in the release of Beaton. A bribe was offered to him in the form of a marriage between his son and the English princess Elizabeth,[3] but he would not submit to the rule of Henry, nor while agreeing to the English marriage would he permit the removal of the queen to England during her childhood. His own interests made him favourable to the independence of his country; but, whatever his motives, his patriotism was sincere.

In the second week of April the Scottish

[1] Sadler, i. pp. 104, 115, 131.
[2] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. p. 284.
[3] Hamilton Papers, i. 348.

ambassadors appointed to treat with England regarding the marriage and regarding a peace, had audience of Henry and the Council. They stated their instructions, that the queen should not proceed to England till she was of marriageable age; that Arran should be governor during her minority, and that afterwards the Scots should elect a native governor; that Scotland should for ever have her own laws and customs; and that the chief strongholds of Scotland should not be delivered into the keeping of England till the queen had children. Amidst the negotiations for peace, they were asked if they would "become frende to frende and ennemye to ennemye," but they refused to disturb the existing treaties with France.

Henry's schemes were very different from those of the Scots. His son was a prince, he said, to be desired for the daughter of any king in Christendom; and as it was not meet that a prince of England should marry any one ignorant of the nurture and fashion of his country, Henry insisted that Mary should be sent to England within two years. The King of England professed to be willing that Arran should govern during Mary's minority; and that afterwards, if he "use himself as apper-

taineth," he should govern under the authority of Henry and his son, but the election of the governor and council of Scotland was at all times to lie with the King of England. The laws and customs of Scotland were to continue unaltered, but the fortresses were to be held by Scotsmen of Henry's selection. Lastly, Henry insisted that, if Mary died, he should be recognised as heir to the Scottish crown.[1] When the English terms were made known, indignation was supreme among the Scottish people. Arran declared for war rather than for acceptance of such terms; and, after dismissing the Protestant preachers from his household, summoned the Cardinal and the Catholic lords in their strength to the meeting of the Estates at which Henry's proposals were to be discussed.[2] This change in the governor's policy, doubtless due to the influence of the Abbot of Paisley, was followed by another change under the inspiration of Angus. Arran refused to allow the Catholic lords to proceed to Edinburgh, accompanied by large forces; and Beaton consequently did not attend the

[1] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. pp. 275 *et seq.*; Sadler, i. pp. 152 *et seq.*

[2] Sadler, i. pp. 147-158.

meeting of the Estates, fearing, in spite of the safe-conduct offered to him, to be taken prisoner. Angus had evidently roused Arran's jealousy, but he had not won him to the side of England. The governor "swore a great oath," and protested that Henry's proposals were most unreasonable, and that there was neither man, woman, nor child who would not rather die than agree to them.[1] At the meeting of the Estates, Lennox appeared as ambassador from France to urge a renewal of the ancient league and the inclusion of France in any treaty between England and Scotland, and to offer men, money, and ammunition, and even the aid of Denmark, if war were declared. At the same time, the English lords informed Sadler that with difficulty they had kept the governor from joining the Cardinal, and that the whole realm murmured that they had rather die than break the ancient league with France.[2]

Henry demanded too much, and the Cardinal, both on account of his imprisonment and his leadership of the anti-English party, was the most popular man in Scotland; and the Church of which he was primate was again freed from the danger of destruction by the people. Once

[1] Sadler, i. pp. 160 *et seq.* [2] Ibid.; Hamilton Papers, i. 357.

more, the cause of the Scottish Reformation suffered at the hands of the man who posed as patron of the reformation of the Catholic Church of Christendom.

The arrival of Lennox in Scotland was not long of producing an effect such as that hoped for by Beaton. Lennox, easily tempted to ally himself with the Cardinal by promises of the governorship and of the hand of the queen-dowager, refused to sign the Act appointing Arran governor and second person of the realm. Arran, incensed at the conduct of his rival to the crown, not only requested from him the signs of allegiance, but also demanded from him the castle of Dumbarton; and, when the request and the demand were alike refused, resolved to declare him a traitor or to drive him out of the land. Forces were prepared for an attack on Dumbarton; but secretly Angus persuaded Lennox to yield. The castle would soon have been in the governor's hands, and probably through Angus in Henry's, had not a letter from Beaton changed the purpose of Lennox, who, leaving the castle secure against attack, fled to the Highlands.[1]

Beaton, amidst intrigues and policies, did

[1] Sadler, i. pp. 197-203.

not mistake his own popularity for a sign that the Church was permanently freed from danger. Henry was unequalled in his perseverance, and was skilled in the uses of gold. Any day, Arran might pass from his isolated position of neutrality to the side of the "English lords," and they together might work Henry's will in reforming the Church. Beaton's aim was, therefore, to draw the governor to his own side; but he did not neglect other precautions for the safety of the ancient religion.

With Arran's consent the Cardinal, in May of this year, 1543, called a meeting of the clergy, in reality for the purpose of determining what sums of money should be offered towards the preparations for war. Some of the leading clergy were unable to attend the convention, which was formally adjourned to meet again in June; but those present offered to give of their own money and plate, and of the plate of the churches, and further, offered on their own parts to fight if need might be.[1]

Thus was Beaton supplied with the means of strengthening his party from the ranks of the nobles and the gentry. Nor did Beaton neglect the aid proffered by France. Arrangements

[1] Sadler, i. pp. 189-204.

were made that under Montgomerie, Sieur de Lorges, a French force should be sent to Scotland, and thereafter the dowager and the young queen should be removed to France.[1] Moreover, Beaton urged that the Pope's legate should hasten from France to join with him in trying the power of excommunication as a remedy against the enemies of the Church.[2]

Beaton's influence in the realm was great, but he and the governor were still at variance; and Arran declared that were peace concluded he would set upon the Cardinal in St Andrews, who was "the man he did only hate in all the world."[3] Beaton, however, knew the man with whom he had to deal, and knew how to deceive him. He therefore intimated that if he were any hindrance to the peace—a peace which he himself secretly dreaded—he would, with the consent of the governor, retire to France; but Sadler, a wiser man than the governor, urged the refusal of his consent, as he judged that Beaton was more likely to inaugurate some new policy than to seek retirement.[4] Henry at this time sent word to

[1] Sadler, i. p. 191. [2] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. p. 286.
[3] Sadler, i. pp. 200, 206 *et seq.* [4] Ibid.

Sadler that the arrival of the Papal legate threatened danger to English interests, and that in case the legate escaped capture in the Channel it would be well for Arran to seize Beaton and Lennox; but Henry ignored impossibilities. Meanwhile negotiations were proceeding between the two countries. The Earl of Glencairn and Sir George Douglas, who had narrowly escaped captivity at the hands of Beaton for his valiant championship of the English cause at the meeting of the Estates, were despatched with answers to Henry's demands.[1] Henry was forced to moderate his ambition; and among his terms, publicly announced, there was no longer mention of the overlordship of the realm or of the occupation of the fortresses. He was willing to settle a treaty of peace, but one which excluded France, and to postpone the delivery of the young queen into England till she had reached her tenth or twelfth year.[2] These were his public terms, but privately he prepared a "secrete devise," which Angus and Maxwell at least of the Scottish nobles are known to

[1] Sadler, i. p. 176; Hamilton Papers, i. 369.
[2] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. pp. 302 *et seq.*

have subscribed. The "English lords" were to secure the delivery of the child at the time stipulated in the treaty, or "as soon as may be"; to guard the safety of the queen, and, in case of her death or of her removal (presumably to France), to acknowledge Henry as lord of the realm; to support Arran if he kept to the treaty, but to support no other as governor; to side with Henry if war broke out, and to help him to secure all the territory south of the Forth.[1]

The governor and his friends accepted the terms delivered to them at the hands of the ambassadors, with the exception of the exclusion of France from the treaty of peace. The Scots would not disown the ancient alliance; but ultimately at Greenwich commissioners from the two countries arranged the terms of the treaties.[2]

In spite of treaties, the Cardinal and his party were busy preparing for war, which was to be declared when help came from France. Lennox returned from the Highlands and collected his men; in the north, Argyle,

[1] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. p. 319; Sadler, i. p. 237.
[2] Rymer, Fœdera, vol. xiv.

Huntly, Murray, and in the south, Bothwell and Hume, joined the Cardinal and made ready their forces.[1]

Henry deemed it dangerous to his cause that Beaton should be free, and, as has been shown, advised Arran to seize him and Lennox; but Arran, as if he had been an "English lord," excused himself on the ground of sickness for not obeying this advice. Arran, however, laid himself open to the charge of insincerity, according to Sadler, because he did not seize Beaton, who made a journey from St Andrews to Arbroath. Arran, on the other hand, declared that any fray at that time would have endangered the settlement of the treaties, and, important surely, that he did not possess the strength to overcome the Cardinal.[2]

Henry was aware that Beaton and his friends looked for aid from France, since by themselves they were unable to carry on a war. It was not unexpected news, therefore, when he heard, on the 30th of June, that a French fleet of sixteen sail, carrying 2000 men, besides money, artillery, and arms, and also letters for the dowager and Beaton and Lennox, had

[1] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. 321; Sadler, i. 214.
[2] Hamilton Papers, i. 389; Sadler, i. 220.

arrived at Aberdeen. From Aberdeen the fleet passed to Arbroath, where Beaton was; and it was then conjectured by Henry's party that the fleet had arrived, not for purposes of war, but for carrying off to France the queen-dowager, the young queen, and the Cardinal.[1] Beaton was now closely watched. He supplied, at his own expense, victuals to two of the ships; afterwards he gave money to build Hume Castle, and such was his state, that the Earls of Lennox, Argyle, Huntly, Bothwell, Montrose, and other temporal and spiritual lords, not only joined his party, but gave their sons or their kinsmen into his household.[2]

Beaton lived with the splendour of a great retinue, and gave banquets to his friends in a style never before seen in Scotland. In this splendour and munificence may be found causes of that jealousy which made so many of the Scottish nobles his enemies. They could not vie with him; and the man who excelled them in splendour was a priest. Some of the nobles, however, were true to him, and the common people in every part of the country adhered to him.

[1] Sadler, i. p. 228; Hamilton Papers, i. 394.
[2] Hamilton Papers, i. 397.

Rumours of the Cardinal's popularity reached England, and it was told to Henry that the governor, believing that Lennox was about to marry the queen-dowager, had determined to ally himself with Beaton and his friends.[1] Beaton, who knew how to use the name of Lennox and to traffic with his claims to the crown, was probably the author of the story regarding the marriage of Lennox, and by inventing it he doubtless hoped to secure the governor.

He did not yet, however, gain Arran; but his strength was so great that Sadler reported that, in the event of a war, the governor could not withstand him. Sadler had further to report that he himself intended to seek refuge in Tantallon, so intense was the popular feeling against England.[2] Henry was furious, and absurd in his fury. Among the many stories from Scotland which reached his ear was one to the effect that the Cardinal had challenged Sir Ralph Eure to combat. Henry heard this story, and believed it; and so anxious was he to be rid of his hated foe that he commanded Eure to fight Beaton at Edinburgh, forgetful that his knight would spurn

[1] Hamilton Papers, i. 400. [2] Sadler, i. pp. 236, 237.

the challenge of the priest, had it been given, and ignorant of the real character of that priest. Suffolk suggested, and he was probably correct, that the story had risen out of the mischief-making of some Border thief.[1]

In England the reports of the war preparations in Scotland produced consternation. Could England interfere when the treaties were not yet signed? Beaton, it was said, had 30,000 men, and the governor but 10,000. Affairs appeared to be still worse for England when it was learned that Beaton, with 7000 men, had gone to Linlithgow, where the young queen resided.

At last Henry resolved to act. He sent £1000 to Arran, and with the money the advice to proclaim Beaton and his friends traitors to the realm; and offered to chastise the Borderers, and to send a fleet to capture the French ships.[2] Henry's enemies did not, however, wait in quietness to be proclaimed traitors. At Linlithgow, on the 24th of July, Beaton and many of the spiritual and temporal lords, among whom were Lennox, Argyle,

[1] Hamilton Papers, i. 414; State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. pp. 320-323.

[2] Hamilton Papers, i. 418, 419; Sadler, i. p. 238 *et seq.*

Huntly, and Bothwell, pledged themselves by a secret bond to stand by one another in defence of the realm and of the young queen's liberty.[1] After executing this bond they opened up communications with the governor, and demanded as the price of peace that the queen should be placed in the keeping of certain lords appointed by Parliament, that the governor should rule with the aid of a council similarly appointed, and that, pending the present arrangements, the Douglases should be required to quit the Court.[2] In the first instance nothing was agreed upon by the opposing parties, save that the queen was to be placed under the care of four Scottish nobles, two to be nominated by the governor and two by the Cardinal.

In spite of the demand that the Douglases should leave the Court, the Cardinal and Angus soon afterwards met on cordial terms, and the two opposing parties agreed to hold a convention for the signing of the treaties between the two countries. Beaton, moreover, intimated to Glencairn that he was desirous of securing the favour of Henry; but former experience made the "English lords" doubtful of his sincerity, and now they suspected an intrigue when he

[1] Hamilton Papers, i. 446. [2] Ibid., 424.

urged that the meeting for the signing of the treaties should be held at Stirling, and when they learned that a ship with money had arrived from France.[1] Henry, however, gave permission to Sadler to see the Cardinal regarding the communication made to Glencairn, but advised that Beaton should be excluded from the proposed council, unless he renounced the red hat and consented to the reform of the Church.[2]

The Cardinal's presence was deemed necessary at the signing of the treaties. The governor therefore, while refusing to hold the meeting at Stirling, offered his own son and the sons of other nobles as pledges for the Cardinal's safety in Edinburgh—and these pledges Beaton accepted; but his enemies placed no trust in his promise to be present at the meeting. It was thought that he was plotting, and that one of his designs was to secure the person of Mary, as he had shown anxiety to gain an entrance into Stirling, where she now lived.[3] Moreover, he had shown the greatest anxiety for an interview with the governor, to which the governor at length consented. Whatever passed between those two men, rumour had it that a promise

[1] Hamilton Papers, i. 426-433.
[2] Ibid., 435.
[3] Sadler, i. pp. 242 *et seq.*

was made to Arran that if he joined the Cardinal his son should ultimately marry the queen.[1]

Henry, on the other hand, was not deficient in similar promises. He urged that Beaton should be made prisoner, or driven north of the Forth to a safe distance from the presence of the queen. He offered a force of 5000 men to the governor, and, as the price of this army, demanded all the fortresses of the south. If Arran consented to these terms, his son should marry the Princess Elizabeth of England, and he himself should be proclaimed king of that part of Scotland which lies north of the Forth.[2]

Henry's schemes were as empty as his promises; but possibly if his promises had been sincere, his schemes might have been accomplished. He erred in demanding too much for himself, even from men who were not dead to honour and patriotism; and from those whose honour was lost and who would have sold their country, he demanded that which they had not the power to give, and promised that which he had not the mind to fulfil.

The governor had not the forces necessary to

[1] Hamilton Papers, i. 437.

[2] Ibid., 439; Sadler, i. p. 246 *et seq.*

drive the Cardinal into the north, and he was equally impotent to convert him into a reformer of the Church, as Henry had formerly suggested he should do. There was no chance, he knew well, of the Cardinal renouncing the red hat, since, by doing so, he would forfeit his chance of the Papal crown. Beaton, however, still continued his policy of deception. He agreed to the treaties being signed; he would not give up his allegiance to France; but, wearied of his extravagant style of living, he was willing to depart to France, if only the governor would meet him at St Andrews and yield consent to his departure. To Edinburgh, however, he would not go, as he now feared for his own safety.[1] Once more Henry resolved to try what fair promises on the one side, and remonstrances on the other, could do to force the signing of the treaties. He advised the governor to proclaim Beaton and his friends traitors if they would not agree to the treaties; while he gave instructions that Beaton should be offered the English archbishopric and primacy, if, even without giving up the cardinal's hat, he would join himself to Henry.[2] At the same time, an order was issued from the Privy Council

[1] Hamilton Papers, i. 452. [2] Ibid., 457.

to certain English commanders to harass the Borderers who were friendly to the Cardinal, and to prepare to receive the Scottish fortresses south of the Forth, which the governor had promised to yield, whenever the treaties were signed.[1]

Henry let it be known to his Scottish friends that he was anxious that the treaties should be signed before the Papal legate arrived in Scotland, and, lest their validity should afterwards be questioned, that Beaton should be present when they were signed.[2] At last, on the 25th of August 1543, Sadler reported that the treaties were signed, though the Cardinal and his friends had not attended the meeting. Arran, however, resolved to make one more effort for peace with Beaton; but though he visited him at St Andrews, and remained with him several days, he returned to proclaim him guilty of treason.[3]

Whatever effect the treaties might have had on the progress of events, they were rendered useless by a rash and foolish act of Henry. Hardly had they been signed, when, in violation of the peace, he seized certain Scottish ships which had taken refuge in an English

[1] Hamilton Papers, i. 458.
[2] Ibid., 461.
[3] Sadler, i. pp. 270-277.

port. News of this outrage reached Scotland, and the excitement was intense. Sadler's house in Edinburgh was surrounded by an angry crowd, and his life threatened. The governor, too, became an object of the popular hatred, since he had shown marked favour to the English cause. Under the influence of the Abbot of Paisley, Arran, however, resolved on a sudden change of policy. He sought the Cardinal at Callander House, and there effected a reconciliation. The two rode amicably to Stirling, where, after giving his son to the Cardinal as a pledge of his sincerity, Arran renounced the Protestant faith, and was received back into the Catholic Church.

On the 9th of September the queen was crowned at Stirling—"with such solemnity," wrote Sadler, "as they do use in the country, which is not very costly."[1] Henry's schemes, intrigues, and promises of the year came to nought by his one act of rashness in seizing the Scottish ships. Arran was lost to him, the queen was crowned, the country was roused against him, and his enemy, the Cardinal, was the most popular man in Scotland.

[1] Sadler, i. pp. 282-289, 300; State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. p. 334.

CHAPTER X.

KING AGAINST CARDINAL.

Beaton, having gained the governor, sought to complete his triumph by inviting Angus to join with him in crowning the queen. Angus and the "English lords" would not, however, take part in the ceremonial, nor would they yield in their allegiance to Henry. On the contrary, they subscribed a bond to be true to one another in their English policy, and thereby enraged the Cardinal, who swore that though it cost him his life he would drive the Douglases from the country.

In accordance with their agreement with Arran, Beaton and the queen-dowager succeeded in establishing a council, of which they themselves became members, to aid the governor in the conduct of public business; and they further exerted their authority in causing

a meeting to be held at Edinburgh towards the end of September for the purpose of deliberating on Henry's recent actions. In the discussions at this meeting, the Cardinal proved himself a skilful debater, as he showed how the treaties, having been broken by Henry, were no longer binding on the Scots. In reply to Sadler's plea that the ships seized by Henry were bound for France, Beaton demanded whether the English king, if he received the hostages named in the treaties, would restore the ships to Scotland; and whether also he would make amends for the warfare waged on the Borders. The ambassador was brought to bay. Yes or no he must reply to this skilful advocate of Scottish rights, and knowing the temper of his master he durst not answer that Henry would make reparation of the damage he had wrought; and so the meeting came to an end without anything being done to ratify the treaties. Privately Beaton assured Sadler of his desire to see the treaties carried out, and of his anxiety to gain Henry's favour.[1] On Beaton's efforts to appear friendly to England some light is thrown by a letter to Henry from his ambassador Wotton, who wrote: "Granvelle told me

[1] Sadler, i. pp. 284-288, 290, 297, 300-307, 333.

that the French king with his council have concluded that the Scots shall make a fair face to your Majesty, and promise that they will deliver the queen-dowager and her daughter into your hands; howbeit when it shall come to the point they shall do clear contrary."[1] Beaton, however, was no clumsy diplomatist, and his professions of friendship, as they were renewed again and again, were not rejected by those they were meant to deceive.

In spite of Beaton's overtures to Henry, rumours of war were heard in Scotland. Henry, when he learned how Sadler had been treated by the infuriated people of Edinburgh, threatened dire vengeance on that city; and bidding Sadler move to Tantallon, gave orders for the preparation of an army to punish the Scots for not carrying out the treaties, which he himself had been the first to violate. A last chance was given to the Scots to send the hostages named in the treaties; but the Scots made no response, although Beaton had represented himself as favourable to the ratification of the treaties.[2] Henry therefore concluded for war, and showed his ignorance of Scotland and his

[1] State Papers, ix. p. 603.

[2] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. pp. 334, 336, 346, 350.

impatient ambition, by commanding the "English lords" to deliver to him the Cardinal and the governor, to change the guard of the queen and appoint in their stead nobles favourable to the English cause, and, lastly, to form the council of government from men entirely devoted to him.[1]

Henry, although he had gained nothing but unfulfilled promises from the "English lords," continued, like a child playing at a game of politics, to make demands which sober judgment would have pronounced impossible of fulfilment.

France was still the hope of Scotland, and France did not fail to render what help she could afford. Money and military stores were consigned to the Earl of Lennox, who, before they arrived, had transferred his allegiance to Henry. The early Scottish historians attribute the cause of this change to Beaton, who, having gained the governor, neglected Lennox. Beaton, however, was not one to make political blunders, and the apostasy of Lennox is to be traced to a romance of love. On the 11th of July, two months before the union of Beaton and Arran, Sadler wrote to England that Lennox would

[1] Sadler, i. p. 312.

gladly join with Angus, if he might wed the Lady Margaret Douglas. When it became known that Lennox sought this alliance, endeavours were made by Beaton's party to retain him; but the attractions of the lady proved stronger than patriotism.[1]

The ships which brought the French supplies to Lennox brought also the Papal legate, the Cardinal Grimani, who, while he remained in Scotland, helped to stay the progress of the Reformed religion, and to convince the nobles by his gold, and the people by his words, that the English marriage would yet prove dangerous to the independence of the country. Everywhere the people were hostile to Henry and favourable to Beaton, as the "English lords" discovered when they plotted to seize Stirling and St Andrews, in order that the queen and the Cardinal might be made captive.

War was inevitable, and the Cardinal was not against it; he had not received the supplies sent from France, but he still placed his hope in that country. Rumour spread the story that with 6000 soldiers of Denmark and 10,000 Scots, all paid by France, he intended to carry the war into England. Neither the

[1] Sadler, i. pp. 323, 326, 327.

English nor the Scots, however, were yet prepared for war. In the end of October 1543, before he left Edinburgh, Sadler proposed to the merchants the restitution of their ships and property, if they would join the English cause; but the merchants with indignation replied that they would rather lose property and life than betray their country. Sadler, as unpopular as ambassador could be, then proceeded to Tantallon; and the fact that he sought refuge with Angus caused the Douglases to share in his unpopularity.[1] About this same time their treachery to their country was further brought to light. At a meeting held immediately after the union of the Cardinal and the governor, the Douglases and their friends pledged themselves to remain true to England, and they despatched messengers to assure Henry of their willingness to fulfil his demands. Somerville and Maxwell, the messengers to Henry, were made prisoners on the road to England, and their despatches taken from them. When the contents of the despatches were now at this time made public, the indignation among the Scots was great.[2] Arran wrote to Angus to dismiss Sadler, as no

[1] Sadler, i. pp. 324, 338, 341.
[2] Letter of Arran, quoted in Tytler, iii. 1.

longer an accepted ambassador in Scotland.[1] In December a meeting of the Estates was held, and the treaties were declared to be at an end, the old alliance with France was formally renewed, and the conduct of Angus was censured as treason.[2] At this meeting the Cardinal's appointment to the chancellorship was ratified, and there is this entry in the records of Parliament, "That my Lord Cardinal has accepted the office of Chancellor in and upon him at the desire of my Lord Governor and Lords of Articles." At the same time, the office of Lord Privy Seal was bestowed upon Hamilton, Abbot of Paisley.[3]

Angus and the "English lords," in order to escape the penalties of treason and the risks of unpopularity, engaged to Arran that they would be loyal to the queen, would oppose England, and would maintain the ancient religion. At the very time when they made this engagement, they sent to England to beg that an army be sent to Scotland to help them against the governor and the Cardinal.[4] The moralist who dwells on the vice of the clergy,

[1] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. p. 348.
[2] Acts of Parl. ii.
[3] Crawford's Officers of State.
[4] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. pp. 355, 362.

which was a cause of the downfall of the Catholic Church, will do well to look at the perfidy of the men who were ranged on the side of the reformed religion.

Angus, had he possessed any of his former strength, would not have heeded the threatened penalties of treason; but the Lords Gray, Rothes, Ogilvy, and Glammis had separated themselves from his party. The Cardinal and the governor had visited them in their houses, and with persuasions and gold had secured them. Thus the "English lords" were reduced in number to the Douglases and the Solway prisoners.

It was probably during this visit to the country of those nobles that Beaton tried to depose Lord Ruthven, who was suspected of heresy, from the provostship of Perth. He directed the citizens to elect Charteris of Kinfauns, who was supported by the Lords Gray and Glammis, and the Master of Rothes. A contest took place, and Ruthven, with the aid of the townsmen of Perth, killed sixty of his opponents, and the scheme of the Cardinal came to nought.[1]

[1] Buchanan, Knox, Spottiswood. Charteris was engaged in one of the plots to assassinate Beaton; but it is not likely that the Cardinal was aware of this fact.

War, long threatened by Henry, was at last declared by his herald in Edinburgh in the month of January 1544. No aid, however, had come to the Scots from France; and the Cardinal, instead of being ready to carry the war into England, was totally unprepared to meet Henry's forces. It was best, it seemed to him, to make no preparations for defence; and in March it was rumoured that he and the queen-dowager were seeking to escape to France.[1] Beaton, however, had no intention of going to France; and from the fact that he did nothing for the defence of the realm, it is evident that he trusted that Henry, as he was engaged in his French wars, would not be able to do more than devastate a tract of the Scottish territory.

In reality Henry was not able to overwhelm Scotland, and intimation was made to Hertford that "the grand attempt on Scotland" was delayed for a season, but that meanwhile the work of devastation was to proceed. Hertford was ordered to advance into the country, and as he marched he was to put all to fire and sword. He was specially instructed to sack and burn Edinburgh, with Holyrood, and the surrounding towns and villages; to sack Leith, and burn and

[1] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. p. 360.

subvert it, putting, when resistance was offered, man, woman, and child to fire and sword without exception. Thereafter Hertford was to proceed to Fife to devastate in like manner, and he was to be careful to spoil and turn upside down the Cardinal's tower of St Andrews, "as the upper stone may be the nether, and not one stick stand by another, sparing no creature alive within the same, especially such as, either in friendship or blood, be allied to the Cardinal."[1] He was further commanded to proclaim Henry protector of the realm and guardian of the queen, and to nail a placard on every church door intimating that the Scots had the Cardinal to thank for their sufferings. These were Henry's intentions, and they show not the anger of a powerful sovereign, but the pitiless personal spite of a savage.[2]

On the 1st of May 1544 the English fleet appeared in the Forth, and Hertford made proclamation that he had come to convey the queen to England to be married to the prince, and if the queen were not delivered to him that he would burn Edinburgh and Leith. No reply was made to this proclamation, save a feeble

[1] Hamilton Papers (Club publication), 93, 94.
[2] Haines' State Papers, i. 12.

attempt on the part of the governor and the Cardinal to prevent Hertford's march from Granton to Leith. Leith was sacked and Edinburgh was destroyed by a fire which raged for three days; and the surrounding country was laid waste. About the middle of May the fleet returned to England, but Hertford was left with an army to devastate the country as he marched homewards.[1]

Knox's account of this expedition is original and graphic. When the fleet arrived in the Forth no one knew who the men were. When word of the fleet was taken to Edinburgh "the Cardinal skipped and said, 'It is the Island-flote,—they are come to make a show, and to put us in fear. I shall lodge all the men of war in mine eye that shall land in Scotland.' Still sitteth the Cardinal at his dinner eating, as though there had been no danger appearing." When, however, the Cardinal and the governor understood that the fleet was Henry's, they "fled as fast as horse could carry them, so that after they approached not within twenty miles of danger."

Henry by his forces had wrought devastation throughout a whole tract of Scotland, but he

[1] Lesley, p. 180 *et seq.*

had not secured the person of the queen, and had not established himself as protector of the realm. Once more he had recourse to intrigue. On the 17th of May he entered into a bond with Lennox and Glencairn, in which he agreed to settle a pension on Glencairn and his son, and to bestow the hand of the Lady Margaret Douglas, and ultimately the governorship, on Lennox, if they would carry out his purposes in Scotland. These noblemen, accordingly, prepared their forces; and, attacking the governor at Glasgow, were defeated. Glencairn fled to Dumbarton, and Lennox to England, where he was married to the Lady Margaret.[1]

On the 3d of June a meeting of the Scottish nobles, including the Douglases, was held at Stirling. The nobles present declared themselves united in their opposition to England; but many of them resenting the weakness of Arran's government, proposed that the queen-dowager should be appointed regent, and Angus be made lieutenant-general of the kingdom. The Cardinal continued his support of the governor; but disunion had now arisen

[1] Rymer, Fœdera, xv. pp. 19-30; Calendar of State Papers, Scotland, i. p. 46.

among the nobles, evidently by the plotting of the Douglases.[1]

In the month of August, Henry renewed his attacks through Lennox, who sailed with a fleet to the Clyde, in the hope of taking the castle of Dumbarton. The castle was his own, but the governor of the castle, who had been appointed to hold it against the "English lords," would not yield it to him, now that he had forsaken the Scottish cause. For a time a petty warfare was waged in Cantire and Kyle, but the main object of the expedition had not been gained when Lennox returned to England.[2]

The disunion of the Scottish nobles now showed its results. On the 6th of November a Parliament was held in Edinburgh, in which the governor declared the Douglases traitors; while a few days previously the queen-dowager, acting in the capacity of regent, had issued a summons for a Parliament to be held on the 12th of November at Stirling, and had suspended the governor from his office. At the meeting in Edinburgh, at which Beaton was present, the Parliament proposed to be held at

[1] Calendar of State Papers, Scotland, i. p. 47; Diurn. of Occur.

[2] Diurn. of Occur.; Lesley, Buchanan.

Stirling was declared illegal, and ambassadors were sent to the queen-dowager to inform her that Parliament, as represented by the members in Edinburgh, would remain loyal to Arran. The dowager was forced to yield, and undoubtedly this intrigue, to which through personal ambition she had been a party, was an attempt of the Douglases to gain supreme authority in the government.[1]

At the meeting of Parliament preparations were made for defending the Borders against the English attacks. Thereafter an attempt was made to take Coldingham, and in the strife 2000 Englishmen scattered a Scottish force numbering 7000. This disaster to the Scots was publicly ascribed to the hesitancy of the Douglases, who, however, managed to delude the governor into believing that they had fought for their country. Arran accordingly agreed to the charge of treason against the Douglases being withdrawn by the Parliament which met in December 1544.[2]

The Douglases, however, were soon to be placed in actual opposition to England. Two English commanders, Sir Ralph Eure and Sir Brian Layton, had arranged an expedition into

[1] Acts of Parliament, ii. [2] Diurn. of Occur.

Scotland in order that they might devastate and conquer. In this expedition violence was wrought on Melrose and its abbey, and indignities were wantonly heaped upon the tombs of the ancestors of Angus. The Douglases were roused as if with the spirit which had animated their dead and had made their name illustrious. If they would not fight for the independence of their country, they would fight for the offended honour of their house. Reinforced by the Master of Rothes and the Laird of Buccleuch with their followers, they attacked the Englishmen and routed them in the battle of Ancrum, February 27, 1545; and the deaths of the two English commanders wiped out the dishonour done to the dead Douglases.[1]

The failure of the expedition led by Lennox was a source of vexation to Henry; but now when he heard of his losses at Ancrum his wrath rose to a fury. His interests in France, however, demanded his closest attention, and for a time he was forced to content himself with that which policy could do for him in Scotland. He accordingly instructed Cassilis to command the "English lords" to see to the ratification of the treaties; and though his

[1] Lesley, p. 187.

resources were being drained by his French wars, he gave orders for the preparation of an army to proceed to Scotland, should the treaties not be ratified. Cassilis found the "English lords" ready to obey; nor were the Douglases hostile to Henry, now that their honour had been satisfied. Through the negotiations of those men a convention of the Scottish nobles was held on the 17th of April 1545, to consider Henry's demands; and Cassilis was empowered to state that the English king would overlook the injuries he had received, if the treaties were instantly ratified. Beaton, however, was determined that Henry's demands should be refused, seeing that now he had strong hope of aid against England from the Kings of France and Denmark, from the Pope, and also from the Emperor, who, according to rumour, was desirous of a marriage between the young queen and his second son. Of these, Francis was the most likely to render assistance to Scotland, as it was to his own interest to distract Henry from the war in France.[1]

Beaton, in the exuberance of this hope, prevailed on the convention to declare the treaties at an end, and to solicit aid from France.

[1] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. 431-437, 444-447.

As the result of this solicitation, Francis, in the month of May, sent 3000 infantry, 500 horse, and a considerable sum of money; and soon active preparations for the war began.[1] A general summons was made to all lieges between the ages of sixteen and sixty to proceed to Roslin Muir on the 28th of July; and on the 9th of August, the Scots, with their French allies, were ready for action.[2] Angus was appointed leader of the van, and the army marched into England, and after two days of skirmishing was disbanded. The Douglases were false to their country; and the expedition, on which Beaton's hopes were centred, ended in an ignominious failure, "through the deceit of George Douglas and the vanguard."[3] Knox describes the expedition as if it were memorable only through the wounded pride of the Cardinal: "Monsieur de Lorge, with bands of men of war, came from France for a destruction to Scotland; for, upon their brag was an army raised, forwards they go towards Wark, even in the midst of harvest. The Cardinal's banner was that day displayed, but . . . it

[1] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. p. 459.
[2] Acts of Parliament, ii.
[3] Diurn. of Occur.; State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. p. 498.

was left so bare that with shame it was shut up into the pock again, and they, after a show, returned with more shame to the realm than hurt to their enemies."

Scottish history was repeating itself within a generation; and, as in the days of Albany and of James V., the army intended to devastate England exhausted its strength in its march across the Borders. Some of the nobles were false to their country, and it is no justification of their conduct that this expedition was planned by a churchman. Undoubtedly the army was prepared to work destruction on the enemy of the Catholic faith; but that enemy was also the foe of Scottish independence, whom every Scot, for love of country, should have hated and resisted. But patriotism was all but dead among the nobles of Scotland, and was to be found chiefly among the churchmen; and the man who was the most zealous upholder of the ancient faith was also the most ardent champion of his country's independence. Henry was not long of following up the Cardinal's futile attack on England by an attack on Scotland. In the autumn of this year, 1545, Hertford, with a great army, entered Scotland; but no resistance was offered to the progress

of his march. Without Angus, resistance was impossible; but Beaton knew that Angus was not to be trusted, although Henry had still to avenge the disaster of Ancrum. Hertford advanced into Scotland along a road of ruin and waste, and the Douglases were among the greatest sufferers. Such a scene as this had not been witnessed in Scotland for a hundred years. The list of destructions is appalling: "Monasteries and friars' houses, seven; castles, towers, and piles, sixteen; market towns, five; villages, two hundred and forty-three; mills, thirteen; spitals and hospitals, three."[1] Kelso, Melrose, Dryburgh were in the catalogue of ruins. How far this work of devastation might have proceeded it is impossible to say, since Henry's anger and vengeance knew no bounds; but the devastation ended only because the country could supply no food to its destroyers.

The result of Hertford's expedition, manifest in the ruins he left behind him, was not seen in any determination of the Scots to sue for mercy or to ratify the treaties. On the contrary, a policy of defence was at once inaugurated. A Border army, it was determined,

[1] Haines' State Papers, i. 54; State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. p. 523.

should be raised; and to meet the expense, a tax of £16,000 was to be levied from the three Estates.[1] Beaton, it was also resolved, should proceed to France to endeavour to raise a large army for the destruction of England; and in his absence the queen with her mother were to reside in the castle of St Andrews—an arrangement to which Arran agreed on the understanding that his son should marry the queen.[2] This was the projected policy, but it did not reach fulfilment.

Henry, on the other hand, was not satisfied with the devastation of a tract of Scotland, as he aimed at the subjugation of the country. His next plan, therefore, was an invasion of the west of Scotland, under Lennox, who for some time had been negotiating for help with the Lord of the Isles.[3] As centres for the action of his forces he was desirous of obtaining certain Border castles, held by Lord Maxwell; but while Maxwell hesitated between patriotism and self-interest, the governor and the Cardinal attacked Caerlaverock, Lochmaben, and Threave, and gained an entrance into them. The castles

[1] Acts of Parliament, ii.
[2] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. p. 549.
[3] Ibid., pp. 477, 482-485, 501-508.

were lost to Henry, but the invasion of Lennox, he trusted, would avenge him of his adversaries.[1] On the 17th of November 1545, Lennox set sail for Dublin, which had been agreed upon as the starting-point for an expedition to Dumbarton; but before Lennox could have reached the Clyde, the Cardinal and Huntly had persuaded the governor of Dumbarton to yield the castle.[2] Lennox, not having obtained from the Lord of the Isles the expected help, did not venture to Scotland; and Beaton therefore was left to triumph over the impotency of Henry's schemes for the subjugation of the country. Beaton's triumphs over Henry's plots were not allowed, however, to remain unavenged.

The King of England in the earlier days of his Scottish intrigues plotted against the liberty of the Cardinal, as he had done in the case of the Archbishop James Beaton. His desire was to have those prelates, each in his own generation, prisoners in England; and had he obtained his desire, it goes without saying that the current of Scottish history would have been changed. Doubtless, in the first instance, the King of England aimed only at the imprisonment

[1] Diurn. of Occur. [2] Lesley, p. 190.

of the Cardinal; but one is almost safe to assert that had Beaton been removed to England, after one of his triumphs over Henry's schemes, he would have died as a traitor to the self-appointed protector and overlord of Scotland. The failure to make Beaton a prisoner led to darker councils.

Henry VIII., Defender of the Faith, then titular head of the Church of England, is exhibited in the State papers of his reign as the aider and abettor of assassins; and the combination of defender of a religious faith and employer of assassins is suggestive of Machiavellian rather than of Christian ethics. An apologist for Henry may point to examples of Papal benediction pronounced on assassination; to instances of other kings, like Macbeth of the tragedy, paying for the dagger of the murderer; even to pious men, like certain of the Covenanters, lying in wait to kill. The apologist may also point to the current ethical ideas of Henry's time, such as that which justified the murder of individuals as a preventive of greater evils;[1] but the Bible which Henry gave into the hands of the people as a guide to right conduct, and the Church of which he

[1] More's Utopia.

claimed to be the head, offered no excuse for the assassin's act.

Beaton has suffered the penalty that attaches to the name of religious persecutor; but to his great enemy belongs the guilt that comes from the meaner crime of the assassin.

Crichton, Laird of Brunston, was the first to calculate, and then to act, on Henry's willingness to remove Beaton from out his path. As he first appears on the page of history, Crichton was an agent of the Cardinal. From Beaton's he passed to Arran's service, and at last became a spy in the pay of the English ambassador. On the 17th of April 1544, Hertford wrote to Henry that one Wishart had arrived, bringing letters from Brunston, and desired to communicate information which consisted of two parts: one part was that the Laird of Grange, the Master of Rothes, and John Charteris would attempt to take or slay the Cardinal as he passed through Fife, and if they apprehended him would deliver him to Henry; but they desired to know his majesty's pleasure therein, and what support and maintenance he would give them, if after the deed they were attacked by their enemies. The second part of the information related to pro-

posals for the destruction of the Scottish religious houses, and especially of the Abbey of Arbroath as belonging to the Cardinal.[1]

From a communication from the Privy Council of England, of date 26th April,[2] it appears that Wishart, after an interview with Henry, was in a position to assure the conspirators that Henry approved of the scheme, and promised that if they slew the Cardinal they would find refuge and protection in England. Nothing more, however, is known of this plot; and we are ignorant whether the conspirators were dissatisfied with Henry's answer, or whether Beaton, discovering the plot, took means to frustrate it.

In the following year a similar plot was devised, and though Brunston's name appears in the documents which witness to it, he was associated with men of higher social rank and of greater political importance.

In a letter, of date 30th May 1545,[3] from the English Privy Council, Hertford was informed that Henry had seen certain letters from Cassilis to Sadler, and that one of them

[1] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. p. 377.
[2] Haines' State Papers, p. 32.
[3] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. p. 449.

contained an offer for the killing of the Cardinal, "if his majesty would have it done, and would promise, when it were done, a reward." By the letter Hertford was to know, in reference to the proposed assassination, that "his Highness, reporting the fact not meet to be set forward expressly by his majesty, will not seem to have to do in it; and yet not misliking the offer, thinketh good that Mr Sadler, to whom that letter was addressed, should write to the Earl of the receipt of his letter containing such an offer, which he thinketh not convenient to be communicated to the king's majesty; marry, to write to him what he thinketh of the matter (he shall say), that if he were in the Earl of Cassilis' place, and were as able to do his majesty good service there, as he knoweth him to be, and thinketh a right good will in him to do it, he would surely do what he could for the execution of it, believing verily to do thereby not only acceptable service to the king's majesty, but also a special benefit to the realm of Scotland, and would trust verily the king's majesty would consider his service in the same."

In a plot of assassination a lie may possibly be a factor worthy of no consideration; but

as a matter of simple truth, Henry saw the letter referred to in this communication.

Sadler, then at Newcastle, acknowledged the command to write to Cassilis, and at the same time wrote that he expected to learn more regarding Henry's wishes from Forster, who was about to be sent as Henry's messenger to the Douglases, Glencairn, and Cassilis. In Sadler's dispatch was included a cipher letter from the Laird of Brunston.[1]

Sadler, in accordance with Henry's instructions, wrote to Cassilis, but received no answer.[2] Apparently Cassilis was dissatisfied with Henry's reply, and was not willing to slay the Cardinal, and thereafter to throw himself on Henry's charity for a reward. Sir George Douglas, however, pressed for a definite reward; and Forster, the English spy,[3] brought word from him to Sadler "that if the king would have the Cardinal dead, if his Grace would promise a good reward for the doing thereof, so that the reward were known what it should be, the country being lawless, he thinketh that that adventure would be proved; for the common saying is that the Cardinal is

[1] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. p. 453.
[2] Ibid., p. 471.
[3] Ibid., p. 467.

the only occasion of the war, and is smally beloved in Scotland." Douglas further desired to know, if the Cardinal were slain, in what manner the reward would be paid. Assassins were evidently able to make terms with kings when murder was their business, without feigning awe in presence of the kingly majesty.

Henry, who liked the idea of the murder, but not the idea of the reward, was relieved from coming to definite terms with Douglas by an offer from Brunston to kill the Cardinal for a small sum of money.[1] This offer precisely suited Henry's character. He would have the murder done, and done on the cheapest terms. Sadler, to whom Brunston's letters to Henry had been sent for transmission, wrote to Brunston that he noted the offer "to take him out of the way that hath been the whole worker of all your mischief."[2] Sadler agreed that it would be an acceptable service to God to take the Cardinal out of the way, and wrote that though Henry would not for sundry reasons directly meddle with the matter, yet the assassination would be a good service both to God and to his majesty. Sadler gave assurance that Henry would so reward them that did him ser-

[1] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. p. 470. [2] Ibid.

vice that they would have good cause to be content; but Sadler desired to know the precise amount demanded by Brunston's friends, and added that if the sum were not unreasonable, then for the Christian zeal he bore to Scotland, he would undertake that the amount at once be paid, though he himself had to pay it. The writer asked that the letter be shown to Sir George Douglas and the Earl of Cassilis.

Brunston and his friends were evidently unwilling to trust to Henry's generosity, and were anxious to gain a promise of reward, so that the king might be implicated in the affair. They desired money, and desired protection if the need should arise for them to flee to England. Henry, while he wished the deed done, and done cheaply, wished also to be relieved of all responsibility in the matter. Nothing more, however, is heard of this plot, though the original offer was to kill the Cardinal for a small sum of money.

Henry was none the less just as anxious as formerly for the death of Beaton, and an opportunity of reaching his desire seemed to present itself, when there was need to test the sincerity of a number of Frenchmen who had deserted to England. Let any others, Henry suggested,

do some notable damage or displeasure to his enemies before they desert, such as "trapping or killing the Cardinal, Lorges, the governor, or some other man of estimation."[1] None of the Frenchmen, however, gained Henry's favour by either trapping or killing the Cardinal.

On the 6th of October 1545, Brunston wrote to Henry from Ormiston, where George Wishart was afterwards captured, that the Cardinal intended to pass to France, but the writer hoped "to God his journey shall be shortit to his displeasure."[2] This may have been a pious hope, but it may also have been a hope implying ungodly interference with the Cardinal's purposes.

On the 20th of October,[3] Brunston wrote to Hertford that his friends were ready to serve Henry, "but his majesty must be plain with them, both what his majesty would have them to do, and in like manner what they shall lippen to of his majesty." Brunston also wrote concerning his willingness to see Sadler, but intimated that the meeting must be secret, as otherwise it would mean to him, the writer, the losing of life and heritage.

There is nothing to show what was the nature

[1] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. p. 512.
[2] Ibid., p. 549. [3] Ibid., pp. 550, 551.

of the service which Brunston's friends were willing to render to Henry, or what was the business on which Brunston was to visit Sadler; but it may be conjectured that the letter referred to Beaton's assassination, and to the terms demanded by the conspirators. Of the period from the last day of October 1545, to the 27th of May 1546, the day on which Beaton was murdered, none of the Scottish correspondence is now to be found. It may therefore be supposed that the correspondence was destroyed because the letters referred to the demand for, and the granting of, Henry's bond of payment to the assassins. It is evident from the previous correspondence that without Henry's concurrence in the deed, and his written promise of a definite reward, Brunston and his friends would not proceed with the assassination. Brunston, according to his letter of the 20th of October, was soon to meet Sadler upon some secret business; and seeing that the correspondence of the subsequent period has been destroyed, it may reasonably be supposed that Brunston's business referred to Henry's bond of payment, and that the letters were fitted to compromise the King of England in the murder of Beaton.

There is no direct evidence in proof of Henry's implication in Beaton's murder; but the destruction of the State correspondence arouses suspicion, and it is a suggestive fact that among the murderers of the Cardinal were Kirkaldy of Grange and the Master of Rothes—men who, according to Brunston's letter of April 1544, offered their services to Henry for the killing of Beaton as he journeyed through Fife.

CHAPTER XI.

PROTESTANTISM AND WISHART.

The chief events of the years between the deaths of James V. and Beaton belong to political history; but during those years the new faith was largely affected by the political changes, and advanced in spite of opposition. The Earl of Arran, before his return to the Catholic Church, was a zealous supporter of the Lutheran faith, as Beaton, by publishing the will which nominated himself as governor, had driven him to the side of the religious reformers, and had thereby given them hope of brighter days. In his household Arran openly kept two ministers of the new faith, and, shortly after his elevation to the governorship, caused one of them to preach regarding the abuses of the Church, and to recommend the publication of an English version of the Bible. Great im-

portance was attached to the reading of the Bible. Lord Lisle strongly urged the governor to "let slip" amongst the people the "Bible and the New Testament in English," that they might know the truth and might learn how to eschew sedition. Arran, in reply, complained that there were no translations of the Bible in the realm, but begged that an Englishman be sent to Scotland to sell copies of the Scripture in the vulgar tongue, and promised him protection. The demand for the Old and New Testament was great. "They be marvellously desired of the people," wrote Suffolk to the English Privy Council, as he advised that the demand of the Scottish people be supplied from England.[1] The Scottish Parliament was without means to satisfy this want of the people; but by an Act of March 1543, the reading of the Scriptures was made lawful, in face of the protests of the clergy.[2]

Arran for a time showed zeal as a reformer: he asked Sadler to write to England for copies of the Bible and of Henry's statutes for the reformation of the clergy, and "the extirpation of the Bishop of Rome." Henry most willingly fostered the governor's reforming zeal. Bibles,

[1] Hamilt. Pap., i. 298, 299, 303, 316. [2] Acts of Parl., ii.

however, were expensive, and there is no mention of a supply being forwarded to Scotland; but advice cost nothing. After promising to send for publication a copy of a volume containing pure and true doctrine, he advised the governor to warn the people to receive the Bible reverently and humbly, with a desire "to learn by it how they may direct their manners, living, and true worshipping of God, and not by carnal fancy to frame themselves such vain and evil opinions as hath by seditious persons been raised in the heads of unlearned people." Henry was explicit in his advice to Arran to abolish the religious orders. Commissioners ought to procure information regarding the manner of the living of the monks; and thereafter the governor should take into council some of the chief nobles, agreeing with them, in the first instance, as to the share each would demand of the lands of the abbeys. After the nobles had been satisfied, and the governor himself had secured his own share of the Church spoils, he ought to deal with the bishops apart, or with the tractable ones, and induce them to sanction this ecclesiastical revolution by promise to them of the lands of their sees, and additions thereto from surrounding inferior religious houses.

Henry advised that certain abbeys be altered "to the state [estate ?] of secular priests," and be charged to send so many poor men to the universities in order that the "state of the clergy" be better preserved; and further, that a provision be made for present members of the religious houses during their lifetime, and that a good portion of the Church lands be set aside for the maintenance of the crown.[1] Henry's scheme for the demolition of the monasteries was marked by thoroughness; but his scheme for the destination of the property was founded on theft, since each notable person was to take what he wished. Arran advised the people to read the Bible with reverence; and promised Henry that when peace was secured between the two countries, he would proceed with the demolition of the monasteries—a purpose justified to his Protestant mind by the argument that, seeing that purgatory did not exist, there was no need to support men to pray for the souls of the dead. In order that Arran might be further strengthened in his reforming work, Henry commissioned a priest, known as Sir Robert Richardson, to go to Scotland.[2] The

[1] Hamilton Papers, i. 348.

[2] Richardson, a canon of Cambuskenneth, dedicated, in 1530,

governor received him well, and afterwards sent him to the Cardinal. What was the purpose of Richardson's visit to Beaton is unknown; but possibly he was sent by the governor, who was not wise in the ways of prelates, to suggest to Beaton the demolition of the religious houses, and to ascertain what share of the property the Cardinal would require. Richardson, however, was not resident in Scotland for any length of time, since, shortly after his arrival, the governor, passing to the Cardinal's side in politics, returned to the old religious faith.[1]

Arran's apostasy or conversion, whatever it be named, was of public significance, inasmuch as it hindered the aid which through the Parliament or the council might have been given to the spread of the Protestant doctrines. In the Parliament of December 1543, he showed his change of faith by indicating that there were grave rumours of widespread heresy in the realm, and his zeal as a proselyte by exhorting the churchmen to inquire for heretics, and to proceed against such according to the laws.[2]

Arran had certainly strong reason as a

his 'Exegesis' to Myln the abbot. A few years afterwards he appeared in London as a Protestant, and became the zealous servant of Cromwell, Henry's minister.

[1] Sadler, i. p. 217. [2] Acts of Parliament, ii.

Catholic to draw the attention of Parliament to the state of the realm. It seemed as if the Reformation of Knox's days had begun. In Dundee the houses of the Black and Grey friars were spoiled; and the abbey of Lindores was attacked. In Edinburgh an attempt was made to destroy the Blackfriars' monastery, and in Arbroath a similar attack against the abbey was frustrated only through the interference of Lord Ogilvy. We have further information regarding the religious condition of Scotland at this period from the correspondence of the Papal legate, Marco Grimani, who arrived in Scotland in the autumn of the year 1543; and from him we learn how marked was the advance of the Lutheran faith.

The Pope, Paul III., wrote to the Scottish king, before the battle of Solway, giving him permission to gather a portion of the tithes of the kingdom for the purpose of defending the realm against Henry VIII.; and, at the same time, commanded Grimani to proceed to Scotland to aid in collecting the tithes. In June 1543, Grimani wrote from Paris to Rome that he had learned from one of Beaton's agents the divided condition of Scotland, and the certainty of a civil war, and that his presence

in Scotland would be dangerous to himself and useless to the Church. Possibly Beaton viewed with jealousy the approach of a Papal ambassador, who might interfere with his own spiritual rule; or possibly Grimani knew that Henry's ships were watching for him in the Channel. In spite of his own letter, however, Grimani, after going through the form of excommunicating those who had imprisoned Beaton, left Paris in July, and proceeded to Scotland. Henry had prepared Arran for Grimani's arrival, and Arran declared that if the Papal legate made any garboil with his fulminations of cursing, or stirred any division or inquietation, he would certainly never return home.

The exact date of Grimani's arrival is unknown, but he has left an account of the religious condition of Scotland at the time of his arrival. The realm was full of heresy, and but for the interposition of God would soon be in the condition of England. The queen-dowager and the Cardinal had spent their money in the cause of the Church; and the clergy were unable to give any aid, as the fruits of their benefices had been seized by the Lutherans.[1]

If these statements are true, the progress of

[1] Conf. Stevenson's Mary Stuart, p. 48 *et seq.*

the reformed faith at this date had made marked advance, and an advance greater than that represented on the pages of the early historians. It may not indicate strength of religious conviction, but it certainly shows strength of numbers, that the Lutherans were able to seize the spoils of the churchmen. If therefore, in 1543, the Lutherans were numerous, as thus indicated, the reason for the delay in the downfall of the Church can only be found in the political fact, that the independence of the country was in danger. The Scots, such of them as were patriotic, banded themselves together under Beaton for the preservation of the national liberty; and while the independence of the realm was in danger, through the action of England, that change in the national Church could not be effected which was advocated by the King of England.

Beaton, as nationalist leader, did not, however, trust to his popularity as the only means to secure the safety of the ancient Church, but resolved to follow the usual procedure for the extirpation of heresy. In the beginning of the year 1544 he was made legate *a latere*,—a dignity which he had long sought, and which at last was bestowed on him in response to

letters from Arran. The original Bull, dated 3 Kal. Feb. 1544, and now in the English State Paper Office, was not despatched from Rome till the following year, when it fell into the hands of English sailors, and never reached its intended destination.[1] Beaton in this year, 1544, was chancellor of the kingdom, archbishop of St Andrews, and primate of Scotland, cardinal and legate *a latere*. In actual power he was governor of the realm, since Arran was but his tool; and to no higher ecclesiastical dignity, save the highest, could he attain. Arran indeed, on one occasion, declared that Beaton, instead of giving up his cardinal's hat, would rather embrace and receive the three crowns; and before the eyes of Beaton, as of Wolsey, may have floated the golden vision of the Papal tiara.

Beaton might have been expected to mark his acquisition of the legatine dignity by a prosecution of the heretics; but while such prosecution was then part of the avowed policy of the Catholic Church, affairs in Scotland prevented the leaders of the Church from an attack on her enemies. From the date of

[1] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. p. 443; *vide* copy of the Bull, Burnet's Collection.

the martyrdoms in 1540, till that of Beaton's attainment of the legatine power, the progress of the new faith was notable, and the most signal help to that progress was found in the declaratory Act anent the reading of the Bible. That Act was published in Edinburgh a few months after the Pope in Rome had sanctioned the adoption by the Catholic Church of a plan for the destruction of heretics. At the colloquy held in Ratisbon, 1541, the Catholic Church, through its chief representative, Gaspar Contarini, made an honourable overture for reconciliation with the Protestant Church; but Contarini's action was repudiated at Rome, and in 1542, on the advice of Cardinal Caraffa, the future Pope Paul IV., the inquisition was authorised by a Bull of date July 21. In Italy especially the inquisition was disastrous to the Protestant faith; but while the Bull of inquisition was addressed to the whole Church, it was impossible for Beaton, the primate of Scotland, at once to obey it. Towards the end of 1545, however, the Cardinal found leisure amidst his political cares to turn his attention to the business of the Church in Scotland.[1] Accompanied by the governor, by

[1] Conf. Keith, i. 97, for this date.

Argyle the Lord Justice-General, and by the Bishops of Dunblane and Orkney, he made a journey through the diocese of St Andrews. At Perth, if tradition is true, he exhibited unparalleled ferocity against certain of the new faith. Buchanan relates that four men were put to death for eating flesh on a forbidden day; and that a woman also suffered death because she refused during the time of her delivery to pray to the Virgin. Knox, who dates the incident at St Paul's day before the first burning of the city of Edinburgh, narrates how a great number of honest men and women were called before the Cardinal and accused of heresy. The special charge against them was that they had eaten a goose upon Friday. Four men were hanged, and the wife of one of them was drowned. At the same time several men were banished, and Roger, a Black friar, was removed to St Andrews, where he was murdered or died in the act of trying to escape.

Spottiswood's account of this raid on the heretics of Perth is more graphic and detailed. He relates that five men were apprehended at the charge of Friar Spence, and were executed: one for saying that a man could be saved without prayer to the saints; three for nailing two

horns on the head of an image of St Francis, for "the putting of a cowes rump to his tail," and for eating a goose on All-Hallow evening; the fifth for keeping company with the others. A woman was charged with refusing, while in labour, to pray to the Virgin, and saying that she would pray to God only in the name of Jesus Christ. Lamb, who had denied the efficacy of prayer to the saints, besought the people, when he was at the place of execution, to fear God and to forsake the "leaven of papistical abominations." The woman made known her wish to die with her husband, who was one of the accused men; but she was condemned to be drowned. As she parted from her husband she said, "Husband, be glad. We have lived together many joyful days, and this day which we must die, we ought to esteem the most joyful of all, because now we shall have joy for ever; therefore I will not bid you goodnight, for we shall shortly meet in the kingdom of heaven." Tradition has added to the historians' accounts that Beaton witnessed the execution of the men, as he sat in the Spy Tower—a building in the Earl of Gowrie's garden by the side of the Tay;[1] while Lindsay of

[1] Chronicle of Perth (Maitland Club).

Pitscottie tells that the Earl of Argyle, for having, as Justice-General, pronounced sentence on those men, was from that day till his death ever diseased both in body and spirit.[1]

According to Buchanan and other historians, the Cardinal proceeded from Perth to Dundee, then the centre of the adherents of the new faith. From Dundee, Beaton with the governor journeyed through Angus and Mearns, and reached St Andrews at Christmas, when great entertainment was made for the pleasure of the governor. This extensive visitation was unattended by any prosecution of the heretics, though it may have been meant to strike terror into their hearts. In his account of this visitation, Buchanan has recorded, either as humour or fact, that such was the ignorance of the priests that they contended that the New Testament was a book lately written by Martin Luther.

Beaton's journey through his diocese was undertaken probably for the purpose of counteracting the influence of George Wishart, who had made himself prominent in those parts as

[1] Beaton granted to Argyle the charter of certain lands for services to the Church at that time when Lutheran heresies were springing up on every side.—Report on Hist. MSS., iv. p. 484.

a preacher of the Reformed doctrines. Heresy was rife, and the new opinions as contrary to the established creed might be crushed by the armed authority of the Church; but everywhere there was a clamour which could not be silenced against the profligacy of the clergy. Hay in his 'Panegyric' on the Cardinal, printed in 1540, dared, even while praising a churchman, to point out the corruptions in the Church, and the dangers involved in their continuance. Tradition has preserved many stories of Beaton's immorality; and if they be true, he certainly was not the man to call the clergy to purity of life. Yet a great danger to the Church seemed to him to arise out of those charges of profligacy which were continually being made against the monks and priests. That danger must be overcome, and Beaton therefore summoned a provincial council to meet at Edinburgh on the 13th of January 1546; and at this meeting of council it was his intention to frame measures for the rooting up of heresy, and for the reform of the manners of the clergy.

Beaton, with the governor, proceeded from St Andrews to Edinburgh for the purpose of presiding over this council, of which, however, little is known, since the Cardinal's plans

were suddenly upset by the news that George Wishart was at the house of Ormiston in East Lothian. More important to the best interests of the Church, it seemed to Beaton, than the reform of the lives of the clergy, was the capture of Wishart, who for a time, in various parts of the country, had been a noted and effective preacher of Protestantism.

Beaton's name has been interwoven with that of Wishart in Scottish ecclesiastical history; and hence Wishart, apart from his own conspicuous merit as a preacher, claims attention.

George Wishart was a teacher of Greek in Montrose, as he is first presented to us on the page of history.[1] He is next seen in Bristol, where he was accused of heresy, and where he recanted. After sojourning on the Continent and returning to England, as is conjectured, he went back to Scotland with the commissioners, Knox says, who had gone to England to deliberate with Henry on the treaties; and immediately after his return he began to preach the Reformed doctrines. In Dundee the people flocked to hear him, and showed their zeal for the new

[1] It is commonly said that Wishart was of the family of Pittarrow; but Laing, in his edition of Knox, declares that nothing is known of Wishart's family.

faith by violence to the houses of the representatives of the old. The magistrates of Dundee, when the danger of violence was extreme, interdicted him from preaching; and so he passed to the western counties, where he openly instructed the people. In the west he was opposed by the Archbishop of Glasgow; but he passed from town to town, till the outbreak of the plague in Dundee recalled him to that place. There, with great devotion, he ministered to the stricken people, and left the town only when an urgent message called him to Edinburgh to meet the friends of the Reformation.

A beautiful picture of Wishart has been made by one who was his pupil,—"courteous, lowly, lovely, glad to teach, desirous to learn"; but the Wishart long popular in tradition was the denunciator of coming woes, who seemed as if he were one of the stern Hebrew prophets who had broken the limits of the centuries and appeared in Scotland.

In Knox's account, Wishart, from the beginning of his career in Scotland, was persecuted by the Cardinal. It was Beaton who contrived to have him interdicted from preaching in Dundee, and it was he who bade the Arch-

bishop of Glasgow oppose him in the west. It was Beaton who suborned a priest to assassinate him in Dundee, and it was Beaton who, on that plot failing, tried to entice him by a forged letter into the hands of his enemies.

These statements, if taken as true, must be accepted on the sole authority of Knox. Yet it is certain that Beaton sought, from the beginning of Wishart's public appearances in Scotland, to seize him, and failed because of those who protected him.

In the west, when Wishart was opposed by the Archbishop of Glasgow, one of his guardsmen was the Earl of Glencairn; when he left Dundee for Edinburgh, it was by invitation of the Earl of Cassilis; when preaching round about Edinburgh, one of his friends and followers was Crichton, the Laird of Brunston; and when in Inveresk, one of his audience was Sir George Douglas, who, after the sermon, openly professed his change of creed. Those men, friends of the Reformation though they may have been, were the political creatures of Henry VIII.; and three of them at least, Cassilis, Brunston, and Douglas, were mixed up in the plot for the murder of Beaton. Moreover, in the first inti-

mation in the State correspondence of a plot against Beaton's life, note was made that "a Scottish man called Wishart brought a letter from the Laird of Brunstone."

It is not possible to identify this Wishart, so as to assert or deny that he is George Wishart the martyr. It has been argued by friends of the martyr's good reputation that Wishart was not an uncommon name in Scotland; that one cannot be certain that Wishart returned to Scotland in 1543, the year in which the ambassadors were engaged with the treaties;[1] that there is no evidence to show that Wishart ever left Scotland after his return; and that a saint like the martyr would not have made himself party to a plot of assassination. On the other side, it has been pointed out that the Wishart who had audience of Henry was not likely to be an obscure and unknown man; that George Wishart, from his knowledge of England and his habits of travel, was fitted to be the bearer of confidential letters, and was not likely to arouse the Cardinal's suspicion that an intrigue was being planned; and also that nothing is now known of George Wishart's place of residence at the

[1] See note at end of this chapter regarding this date, and its importance in reference to Wishart.

date of Brunston's letter. Further, it has been pointed out that one cannot argue from modern ethical ideas against George Wishart's connivance at a plot of murder, since religious zealots in former times approved of murder, if done as for God's sake; and that John Knox applauded the murder of Beaton when it was actually done. Further still, it has been shown that the first plot was for the capture or slaying of the Cardinal, and that George Wishart, if he were the bearer of the letter, might have approved not of the slaying but of the capture of Beaton.[1] From the documents known to us, a definite conclusion cannot be come to regarding the identity of the Wishart who was the bearer of Brunston's letter; but if that Wishart was the future martyr, his share in the plot of assassination may in part account for the perseverance with which Beaton pursued him.

Whatever the decision at which we arrive in regard to this question of identity, we are not in doubt as to George Wishart's connection with the men who were plotting against the Cardinal. Though he were ignorant of the intrigues,

[1] Contrast the arguments of Tytler (History and also in the Life of Sir T. Craig), and of Laing (edition of Knox's History).

he must surely have known the character of Brunston, one of the visitors with him at Ormiston, who in the business of spying had passed from Beaton to Arran, and from Arran to Henry of England; and he was from time to time in the company of Cassilis and Sir George Douglas, and his own death was avenged—at least one of the conspirators said so—when the Laird of Grange and the Master of Rothes murdered the Cardinal in the castle of St Andrews. When it is seen that among Wishart's friends were Brunston, Cassilis, Douglas, Kirkaldy of Grange, and the Master of Rothes—the men whose names are found in the documents which witness to the plots for Beaton's assassination—it appears reasonable to conclude that George Wishart was the bearer of the Brunston letter.

Wishart's prophetic utterances—if the words were not put into his lips by later writers—afford further proof of his complicity with the "English lords," the enemies of Beaton's political schemes. Those utterances, if more than general diatribes against wickedness and warnings of "the wrath to come," must have been founded on definite information. In Dundee he spoke in mysterious words of some impend-

ing calamity;[1] and though the plague which visited Dundee seemed afterwards to verify his prophecy, it is now known that in 1543, the probable date of Wishart's prophetic utterances, Henry VIII. was meditating the destruction of Scotland.

Another of the prophetic utterances has been recorded by Knox. It was spoken against Haddington, on an occasion when Wishart, preaching there, did not obtain the audience he expected. "Yea, thou Haddington in special," cried the preacher, "strangers shall possess thee; and you, the present inhabitants, shall either in bondage serve your enemies, or else ye shall be chased from your own habitations, and that because ye have not known nor will not know the time of God's merciful visitation." Spottiswood, remembering the year 1548, added, "Which came shortly to pass." Knox asserts that he was present when this denunciation was pronounced; and it is reasonable, therefore, to suppose that the incident occurred immediately before the seizure of Wishart at Ormiston, when Knox is known to have been in his company. If this supposition be correct,

[1] Knox says that the beginning of Wishart's "doctrine was in Montrose; therefrom he departed to Dundee."

we conclude that the preacher was a true prophet of the events of 1548, or that in his zeal or anger he used words which amid the troubles of the State he was almost safe to utter. Knox, however, admits that he was not accurate with dates, and consequently, if the prophecy were fulfilled, the time when it was uttered was earlier than that of the visit to Ormiston. There is one other plausible explanation of the insertion of the words into Knox's 'History.' The historian, writing in after-years, and remembering what actually happened to Haddington in 1544, and what were Wishart's experiences there on the occasion of his preaching, put into his lips words which never were spoken.[1] In 1544 instructions were given to the English commander, Sir Ralph Eure, to visit Haddington and burn it, and these instructions were carried out, most likely as a punishment to Bothwell for his defection from Henry. This fact was probably present to Knox's mind when he pictured Wishart as the prophet of Haddington's evil fate.

Wishart, it may well be believed, could not have had information regarding Henry's inten-

[1] Wishart's words apply to the destruction of Haddington in 1544 rather than to the English occupation of the town in 1548.

tions, if the date of the supposed prophecy was anterior to that of the destruction of the town in 1544. Henry's letter of instruction to the English commander was written shortly before the 14th of April 1544,[1] and on the 24th of the same month it was reported that Wishart, the bearer of the Brunston letter, had arrived in England. We are safe to conclude, therefore, that if George Wishart was the bearer of the letter, he could not by any possibility have returned to preach in Haddington before May, when the Hertford devastations began; and are safe also to conclude that before the time when the letter of instructions to the English commander was written, the preacher could not have learned Henry's intentions regarding Haddington.

It has been argued that this prophecy is indicative of Wishart's participation in, and knowledge of, the schemes and plots of Henry and the "English lords"; and that it affords another proof of his share in the political intrigues of the day, one of which was the assassination of Beaton.[2] Could it be proved that

[1] The exact date is unknown, but on April 14th, Eure made known to Hertford the instructions regarding Haddington. Haines' State Papers, i. 26.

[2] Tytler. Appendix to Life of Sir Thomas Craig.

before May 1544 Wishart gave utterance to the prophecy, there would certainly be convincing evidence of his interest in the political movements of the party opposed to the Cardinal; but while he may have had this interest, it is highly improbable that he ever uttered the words which Knox has recorded.

Wishart's zeal as a Protestant preacher is enough to account for Beaton's anxiety to lay hold of him, and even to account for the attempts which, according to Knox, he made on Wishart's life; but if the Cardinal knew that Wishart was a party to the plots of Brunston, and if he knew of the plots, as he probably did, of Cassilis and Douglas, Wishart's friends, it is still more easy to explain the reason of the persistent persecution which ended in Wishart's death.

Wishart, as has been seen, left Dundee in response to a call from the Earl of Cassilis. The supporters of the Reformation probably intended some new departure in their policy, which was abandoned when they learned that Beaton had appointed a clerical council to be held in Edinburgh. While attending the meeting of this council, the Cardinal learned that Wishart was at Ormiston, and he hastened to

lay hands on him. On the evening of the day on which he preached in Haddington, according to Knox's account, Wishart was at Ormiston in company with Cockburn, the master of the house, Sandilands of Calder, and Crichton of Brunston. At midnight the Earl of Bothwell and a company of his men surrounded the house and demanded the surrender of the inmates. Wishart, after an assurance that his life would be safe, yielded himself to Bothwell, and was then taken to Elphinstone, where Beaton with a force of 500 men was waiting his arrival. Brunston escaped, but Cockburn and Sandilands were conveyed to Edinburgh, where for a time they were kept as prisoners.

Bothwell, in accordance with his promise, took Wishart to Hales, the Earl's own residence, but shortly afterwards delivered him to the Cardinal. Knox, with his hatred of the queen-dowager, declares that by unholy promises she gained Bothwell, who was not able to withstand "gold and women, which have corrupted all worldly and fleshly men from the beginning." The register of the Privy Council of Scotland shows, however, that Bothwell was forced to deliver his prisoner into the hands of

the governor. Wishart was removed to St Andrews, where the Cardinal summoned a council to deliberate on the case of this heretic. Arran could not, or would not, attend at St Andrews; but, on the secret advice of Hamilton of Preston, proposed that proceedings should be stayed till it was possible for him to take part in the case. Beaton, however, would not countenance delay, and by virtue of his legatine powers proceeded at once to a trial. A charge of eighteen counts was preferred against Wishart, relating to the sacraments, saints, purgatory, and the marriage of priests.

Wishart, in his defence, claimed that his teaching was in accord with that of the Bible, and that he was at liberty to deny all doctrines not founded on the Bible. Resolute in his answers, he made no attempt to save his life by the sacrifice of truth; and mercy was not shown him. He was condemned to death, and on the 28th of March 1546 was burned at St Andrews, praying thrice as he knelt: "O Thou Saviour of the world, have mercy upon me; Father of heaven, into Thy hands I commit my spirit."

The guns of the castle, Knox reports, were directed against the square in which Wishart

was burned, lest an attempt at rescue should be made; and, according to Buchanan and Lindsay of Pitscottie, the windows of the castle were hung with tapestry and silk, as if the day were a holiday or festival — and from these windows the Cardinal and his friends witnessed the death of the martyr. Fortunately for the reputation of the Cardinal, this instance of tyrannic cruelty may be doubted. In the earliest edition of Knox's 'History' and of Foxe's 'Martyrs,' and in the 'Tragedy' of Sir David Lindsay, there is no mention of this barbaric display; and there is every reason to think that those men would not have been silent regarding a scene which, had it been enacted, they must have known. They are silent also as to the prophecy regarding Beaton's death, which others have attributed to Wishart. The dying Wishart is reported to have said, "He who in such state, from that high place, feedeth his eyes with my torments, within a few days shall be hanged out at the same window, to be seen with as much ignominy as he now leaneth there in pride."

If those are Wishart's words, they are the witnesses of his meanness of soul. The first martyr of the Christian Church died like his

Master, in the spirit of charity. Sir Thomas More, to take another example, passed from earth with the courtesy of a gentleman and the charity of a Christian. George Wishart, if he uttered the prophecy ascribed to him, had not learned how to die as a Christian.

The prophecy could not have proceeded from a store of supernatural knowledge; and those who believe that Wishart was a prophet, must be able to show that he was not speaking with something like a criminal knowledge of intended murder.

As the historians who are silent regarding the scene of the draped windows of the castle are silent also regarding this prophecy, it may be accepted as truth that Wishart died, as befitted a martyr for the cause of Christ, displaying the mildness and the charity of his Master.

Note.—Emery Tylney and Knox are the sole authorities regarding the date of Wishart's return to Scotland. Tylney says: "About the year of our Lord 1543 there was in the University of Cambridge one Master George Wishart. . . . He went into Scotland with divers of the nobility who came for a treaty with Henry VIII." Knox's words are: "In the midst of all the calamities that came upon this realm, after the defection of the governor from Jesus Christ, came into Scotland that blessed martyr of God, Master George Wishart, in company of the commissioners before mentioned, in the year of our Lord 1544." These commissioners, Knox says, "were sent from the Parliament to King Henry"; and as it is known that they returned

in July 1543, it seems reasonable to take 1543 as the year of Wishart's journey into Scotland. It has been argued, however, that there were certain commissioners who went in 1544 from Scotland to England, and that Wishart probably travelled back with them. These men, acting not in the name of the Scottish Parliament, but in the names of Lennox and Glencairn, arranged a secret and private treaty with Henry's commissioners at Carlisle. They do not correspond to Knox's description of the men with whom Wishart journeyed. It is not probable, moreover, that Wishart went from Cambridge to Carlisle in order to cross the Border with them; and it is still less probable that Tylney knew anything about commissioners intrusted with the business of an intrigue. Amidst the troubles of the Hertford expedition Wishart perhaps returned, but it is to be remembered that as in July 1543 Arran, the governor, professed the Reformed faith, Wishart was safe to proceed to Scotland. Before May 1544, the date of the private treaty between Henry and Lennox, Arran had renounced the new faith, and was under the domination of Beaton. It seems reasonable to conclude from the whole evidence that Wishart returned in 1543, and not in 1544 when Arran was the tool of the cardinal.

CHAPTER XII.

THE ASSASSINATION OF BEATON.

The political events of 1544 and 1545, when Henry wrought disaster in Scotland and tried to overthrow her independence, made Beaton the most popular man in the country. The popularity was deserved, inasmuch as it was he who successfully baffled the plans and intrigues of Henry and the "English lords"; but public opinion regarding the Cardinal was largely changed by his procedure in the case of Wishart. Whatever may have been the private reasons which induced Beaton to pursue his victim with such vehemence, the martyrdom, apart from its ethical and religious bearing, was a gross blunder in public policy. The plans to assassinate Beaton could, in the nature of things, be known to only a few persons; and

though Wishart may have been implicated in these plots, and the full measure of his guilt known to the Cardinal, the people who were ignorant of the plots looked with favour on Wishart. Many accepted him as a teacher of divine truth, and many admired him for his benevolence during the time of the plague in Dundee. Besides those people, there were doubtless others who had the strongest antipathy to the sacrifice of men to death because of their religious opinions, and who, without consciously admitting or asserting the doctrine of toleration, were opposed to the punishment of heresy by death. On the other hand, the ignorant and the bigots, who were under priestly domination, applauded the Cardinal's conduct; but while the numbers of his adherents and opponents cannot be determined, the loss to his popularity was great, and only the successful baffling of another English intrigue could have restored him to his former position in the public favour. The opportunity of regaining popularity never, however, came to him.

After Wishart's death, John Leslie, brother of the Earl of Rothes, declared openly that

he would assassinate the Cardinal; and Norman Leslie, the Master of Rothes, made the same declaration, in spite of the fact that he was joined to Beaton under the ancient Scottish form of a bond of manrent, in virtue of which he pledged himself to protect, and render service to, Beaton. Knox declares that John Leslie "in all companies spared not to say that that same dagger, showing forth his dagger, and that same hand should be put in the Cardinal's breast," or as Spottiswood says, "that his hand and dagger should be the Cardinal's priests." The Leslies, however, had a grudge against the Cardinal, as Norman Leslie and he had quarrelled. It appears that Sir James Colville of Easter Wemyss, one of the first judges of the Court of Session, espoused the cause of the Douglases, and with them departed to England when they were outlawed by James V. In 1540, after his death, Colville's estates were forfeited and given to the family of Rothes; but this forfeiture, by the influence of Beaton, was reduced by Parliament in 1543, and the Leslies were in consequence offended with the Cardinal. Probably Beaton had promised some equivalent to the Leslies; and the supposition is that, shortly before the Cardinal's death, he

and Norman Leslie had quarrelled over the non-fulfilment of this promise.[1] It is to be remembered that Norman Leslie was one of those who consented to the plan of assassination divulged in the Brunston letter.

Beaton probably heard of the threats against him, but held them of no account, seeing he had overcome so many attempts against his life, and seeing also he was on terms of friendship with many of the most powerful nobles through their common opposition to England. Further security seemed to lie in the fact that he had entered into bonds of manrent with several of the nobles who were thus engaged to protect him.

Shortly after the death of Wishart, Beaton proceeded to Finhaven Castle, Forfarshire, where his daughter was married in great state and pomp to the eldest son of the Earl of Crawford. Hearing that Henry was preparing for another invasion of Scotland, he returned in haste to St Andrews to urge forward the work of fortifying his castle. After Easter, according to Knox, he visited Edinburgh, and there there was rumour of a plot against him, devised by the

[1] Hay's MS., quoted in Brunton and Haig. See also Tytler's Life of Craig.

Douglases, which came to nothing. From the records of the Privy Council, it is proved that he was in Edinburgh on the 23d of May, when he attended a meeting of the Council, held for the purpose of considering a question relating to the Borders.

Immediately after the meeting of the Council he went back to St Andrews, and, Knox says, called a meeting of the gentlemen of Fife for Monday, the last day of May. "This treasonable purpose was not understood, but from letters and other sources it transpired that he meant to kill or capture the Leslies and others who were mixed up in the plot which resulted in the murder of the Cardinal." What Knox in this passage describes as treasonable appears to be a very innocent act of prudence by a man who had heard sinister rumours against his own safety. It does not seem likely that Beaton would thus have sought to kill or capture his enemies, or that those enemies would have been foolish enough, amidst rumours and reports of their intended act, to trust themselves into his hands. Buchanan gives a more plausible account of the purpose of this meeting at Falkland, when he says that it was Beaton's intention to seek the aid of the gentle-

men of Fife in arranging for the protection of the east coast against attack from Henry. Beaton, however, did not live to see the Monday of Knox's story.

On Friday the 28th of May 1546, Norman Leslie went by night to St Andrews, where he found the younger Kirkaldy of Grange,[1] and at a later hour they were joined by John Leslie. In the early morning of Saturday the conspirators gathered in knots around the castle; and when the gates were opened and the drawbridge was let down, arrangements necessary for the work of repair then being carried out, the sentinel told Kirkaldy, who questioned him, that the Cardinal was not yet awake. While the sentinel was thus talking to Kirkaldy, Norman Leslie and his company passed into the court of the castle, as he was probably wont to do, without raising suspicion; but when John Leslie approached, a man who had threatened his dagger against the Cardinal's life, the sentinel suspected foul play, and sprang to the bridge across the moat. But the attempt to draw the bridge was too late, and the sentinel, his head broken, was cast dead into the ditch,

[1] Kirkaldy's father, probably by Beaton's influence, had been deposed from the office of Treasurer.

and the conspirators with his keys were left masters of the principal gate. The noise of this tumult roused the fears of the workmen for their own safety; and they, numbering a hundred, were easily put outside the walls. The servants and attendants of the Cardinal, to the number of fifty, were ejected in the same easy fashion; and the suspicion naturally arises that means had been used to prepare at least the chief servants and attendants for this attack. Possibly the conspirators, through Norman Leslie, who had entrance to the castle, had taken the opportunity of Beaton's absence in Edinburgh to corrupt the servants, and gain their promise to offer no resistance when an attack was made.

Kirkaldy, who knew the secret arrangements of the place, hastened to the postern-gate, lest Beaton should escape by it. Beaton, when he heard the tumult in the castle-yard, and learned that the Leslies were there, went at once towards this postern, but escape was there impossible. Instantly he returned to his room, and caused his chamberlain to heap up boxes inside the door. It was not long till John Leslie found his way to this door and demanded entrance. "Who calls?" asked the Cardinal.

"My name is Leslie," was the reply. "Is that Norman? I will have Norman, for he is my friend," cried the Cardinal, but his cries were in vain. He besought the conspirators to promise to spare his life, and after this promise he would give them entrance; but the promise was not made, and fire was set to the door, which was instantly opened from within. The Cardinal, sitting on a chair, cried to the men who thronged his chamber: "I am a priest! I am a priest! ye will not slay me!" John Leslie was the first to strike a blow with that dagger which he had declared was to be the Cardinal's priest. Then followed Peter Carmichael with his dagger, and last of all, James Melvil approached, a man, according to Knox, most gentle and most modest, who, thrusting aside the other assassins because of their anger, said, "This work and judgment of God, although it be secret, ought to be done with greater gravity." Melvil, presenting the point of his sword at the wounded Cardinal, called on him to repent of his former wicked life, and especially of shedding the blood of Wishart; and then, when his speech was done, and without giving time for repentance, he struck his sword twice or thrice through

Beaton's body. Thus was Beaton killed, and as he was dying, he murmured, "I am a priest; fy, fy, all is gone."[1] "These things we write merrily," says Knox, in his account of the murder. "Although the loon be well away, the deed was foully done," are Sir David Lindsay's words.

News of the fray quickly reached the town; but the murderous business in the castle was speedily transacted, and when the townspeople arrived Beaton was dead. They, ignorant of what had happend, demanded to see the Cardinal; and his friends began to prepare a rescue, when they were stopped by the sight of the dead body. The conspirators, that the people might see their god, as one report had it,[2] fastened the body of the Cardinal, dressed in the pontifical robes, by the leg and arm to a sheet, and lowered it through a window and down the wall, and left it before the gaze of the horrified spectators.[3] The window through which the body was lowered, it is now said, was that afterwards chosen by tradition as the one from which the Cardinal had witnessed the dying sufferings of Wishart.

[1] Buchanan, Knox, &c.
[2] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. p. 560.
[3] Conf. Stevenson's Mary Stuart, p. 69.

The curious who may wish to find examples of savage treatment of the dead will learn in Lindsay of Pitscottie the indignity said to be done to the body of the man who, according to Knox, was killed with the gravity due to a work and judgment of God—and in Dempster, the punishment which, he says, fell upon the perpetrator of this indignity.

The body was preserved in salt and encased in lead, and then placed in the sea-tower of the castle, till such time as the funeral obsequies might take place. Those obsequies were long delayed, and were never made in the style deemed fitting for a prince of the Church and a chancellor of the kingdom. Nothing is known for certain regarding the grave of Beaton. It was said that he was buried in Kilrenny churchyard, beside dead members of his family; but Sir James Balfour wrote that the body, after lying nine months in the sea-tower, was buried secretly in the ground of the Blackfriars' monastery in St Andrews.[1]

Owing to the loss or destruction of the State correspondence, already referred to, it is now impossible to determine the share of Henry VIII. in the murder of Beaton. It is beyond

[1] *Vide* Wood, 'East Neuk of Fife.'

question, however, that the absence of official correspondence is in itself enough to rouse suspicion that documents implicating the English monarch have been at some time intentionally destroyed. In the letters sent to England regarding the murder, there is no mention of Wishart's death as having led to it; but it is said simply in one letter that Norman Leslie slew the Cardinal,—and in another, that Norman Leslie and Kirkaldy of Grange were the slayers of the Cardinal. A third letter, one to Lord Wharton, gives an account of the assassination, and mentions by name only Norman Leslie, Kirkaldy, and James Melvil, and speaks of Norman Leslie as the leader of the company.[1] Neither the Leslies nor Kirkaldy had reason to be aggrieved by Wishart's death, as James Melvil professed to be; and it is not at all probable, therefore, that Wishart's martyrdom had any connection with the action of the Leslies and Kirkaldy of Grange. Nor is it likely that a personal dispute between Leslie and the Cardinal, probably regarding a contract implied in a bond of manrent, was a sufficient incitement to murder, for those who joined themselves together to slay the Cardinal.

[1] State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. pp. 560, 561.

The official correspondence lost out of the State Papers could possibly have told Henry's terms with those who had offered to murder the Cardinal, and have explained why, in two unsigned letters to unnamed recipients, Leslie and Kirkaldy alone are mentioned from among the conspirators. These men were among Henry's pensioners, and it may be that word was sent to England to show that they had done something to earn their pensions. Certainly, they must be considered to have earned the pensions, since they were continued to them after Beaton's death; but the lost correspondence and the two secret letters suggest that Henry had not at least drawn back from his encouragement of the plots of assassination. The continuation of the pensions, and the help sent to the conspirators in the castle, are the only positive evidence that Beaton's death cost the King of England any sum of money; but in the absence of sufficient motives to account for the formation of the band of conspirators against the Cardinal's life, we are forced to conclude either that Leslie and Kirkaldy were inspired to the murder by promises of reward from Henry, or that they did the deed, hoping for reward, and certain that

their act would be pleasing to the King of England.

According to the canon law, mass could not be celebrated within the realm till atonement had been made for the death of the Cardinal.[1] On the 10th of June 1546 the conspirators were summoned to appear before Parliament, but, paying no heed to the summons, they continued to hold the castle of St Andrews. Proclamation was accordingly made by the Privy Council that no one should hold speech with the conspirators, nor should supply them with, nor sell to them, any victuals. In order, however, that they might not plead fear of the Cardinal's friends as an excuse for not answering the summons to appear before Parliament, proclamation was made that those mentioned in the summons should be allowed to pass unmolested to Edinburgh; but even this offer of safe-conduct did not induce the conspirators to leave their stronghold, and they were therefore declared traitors.[2] The Church, too, added her penalty to this sentence of treason, and they were formally excommunicated according to ecclesiastical usage.

[1] Stevenson's Mary Stewart, p. 75.

[2] Regist. of Privy Council of Scotland, i. pp. 26, 31, 32, 38, 39.

On the 12th of July 1547, a commission was issued in name of Mary, Queen of Scots, appointing certain judges "to call and accuse by indictment" the Earl of Rothes, father of Norman and brother of John Leslie, for being art and part of the treasonable murder of David, Cardinal Archbishop of St Andrews, and Chancellor of the kingdom.

After the usual formalities, a court was held on the 15th of July, in presence of the governor and the Lord Chancellor, in the fields near the water of Yarrow, in the county of Selkirk, at seven o'clock in the morning. At this court the Earl of Rothes appeared and denied complicity in the murder, and thereafter was acquitted and altogether freed of the crime charged against him.[1]

Norman Leslie, Kirkaldy of Grange, the Lairds of Brunston and Ormiston, and others of the conspirators, had found a refuge in England;[2] but in 1554, after the coronation of Mary of England, they were banished from that country, and so passed to France. Norman

[1] Report on Hist. MSS., iv. p. 504.

[2] After the siege of St Andrews, Kirkaldy of Grange, the two Leslies, and Peter Carmichael were taken as prisoners to France. In Mont St Michel they overcame their guards and escaped, and afterwards passed to England.

Leslie, who by this time "had repented very soir" of his share in the murder of Beaton, sought to recover his lost honour by service in war; and having gained the charge of a hundred light horsemen of the army of Henry of France, fought valiantly in a war against the Emperor, but died of his wounds on the 29th of August 1554. The King of France, to recompense this service, sent Kirkaldy of Grange and his companions back to Scotland, and by his influence gained from the queen and the Estates the reversion to them of their lands.[1] One writer has pointed out that the murderers of Beaton each died a violent death —Norman Leslie from wounds received in battle, and Kirkaldy of Grange on the gallows.

On the 3d of July 1575, in consequence of the repentance of John Leslie for his share in the Cardinal's murder, the Earl of Crawford, grandson of Beaton, and others of the Beatons, executed a deed of remission, known by the name of Letters of Slains, by which they forgave to John Leslie the rancour of their wrath and deadly feud and malice for the slaughter of the Cardinal, and received him into their hearty love, favour, and kindness, as lovingly

[1] Lesley, p. 249.

as if he had never committed the said slaughter, or been partaker thereof.[1] In Leslie House there is still preserved an ancient dagger which tradition says is the weapon with which the Master of Rothes stabbed the Cardinal.[2]

The murderers of Beaton, as has been shown, and all implicated in the deed, or connected with the actual perpetration, were excommunicated; and as this excommunication affected many men of high rank, and involved many social as well as spiritual hardships, the governor wrote to the Pope, and to the King of France to solicit the Pope, for absolution to all concerned in the murder.[3] Francis seems to have secured and sent to Arran a kind of absolution for the "slayaris"; but for some reason this absolution was deemed insufficient, and Henry, King of France, was therefore asked to send to the Pope for wider absolution.[4] There is no document to show that the Pope agreed to the demand of Arran, yet there is reason to believe that a solicitation from the governor of Scotland would meet with a favourable response from Rome. With the absolution from the Church, and the Letters of Slains from the family of the Beatons,

[1] Report on Hist. MSS., iv. p. 492.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid., v. p. 309.
[4] Ibid., p. 651.

the work of charity towards the murderers of Beaton was complete; and, as illustrating the social order of Scotland in the period immediately anterior to the Reformation, it is to be observed that though the murderers of Beaton were known, and though they were murderers of the Primate of the Church and Chancellor of the realm, none of them suffered death for the crime.

Beaton's death was followed before many months by that of Henry VIII. Both had gained and both had lost in their long struggle, but neither lived to see the ultimate gain and loss. Throughout a generation plots were planned, intrigues devised, battles fought, and gold was spent, and against those fearful odds the independence of Scotland was maintained. By policies less heroic and successes less glorious than those of the days when Wallace was deliverer and Bruce was king, Beaton saved Scotland from the grasp of England. His work before he died was a preparation of defences against what proved to be Henry's last attack on the country which the English had so often assailed; but he died before that attack was made, and before he knew that Scottish liberty was safe.

It is not often given to a priest, who can achieve no victory by the splendour of his arms, to be numbered among the saviours of civil liberty and political independence; yet plain historic truth must give to Beaton, what popular tradition refuses him, a place among Scotland's greatest statesmen and among her patriots.

Henry VIII. heard the welcome news that his plots against Beaton were at last successful, and that his enemy was slain; but he did not live to learn that the vision which English kings for many centuries had cherished, and which he himself had kept ever before his eyes, the vision of England's political supremacy over Scotland, was but an empty dream. Nor did he live to know, what Beaton never knew, that the Reformation of the Church in Scotland was nothing short of a social and spiritual revolution. Scotland's independence was to be preserved, but her ancient Church was to be destroyed; and thus in the struggle which lasted throughout a generation, Beaton and Henry VIII., while they did not witness the end of the struggle, each lost and each won.

Nearly three hundred and fifty years have passed since Beaton's death, and his political work is forgotten, and he is remembered only

as the man around whose name cluster stories of immorality, who was the destroyer of George Wishart the martyr. Wishart has kept the memory of Beaton living, and but for him the name of "the great Cardinal" might have been known to none save the students of history. Beaton has suffered the fate of those whose lot it was to belong to an old and dying social order, and his best work with his worst has been buried with the past. He spent himself, apart from his purely political interests, in continuing a spiritual system which was inadequate to the wants of the people, and in supporting a Church which, to say nothing worse of it, was an anachronism. His labour was in vain, and whatever may be the truth of Protestantism or of Catholicism, Scotland chose Protestantism; and the revolution, which was accomplished at the Reformation, utterly destroyed the work of Beaton and of the lesser men who had striven to support the old social and spiritual order. With that labour which was in vain there has been forgotten that political work which was not in vain; and there remains only the Cardinal Beaton of tradition, the destroyer of the Protestant martyrs, the vicious prelate.

Moralists will ever regret the unchastity of

men who, in their day, were conspicuous by their social influence; and preachers will lament the worldliness of those who, representing a religious institution, violated its spiritual laws. It is not, however, to lower the value of the moralist's or the preacher's calling to assert that history is less concerned with the morality or the piety of her chief actors than with their public policies. Beaton, it is to be asserted, was a typical prelate of the pre-Reformation times, in so far as immorality and worldliness are concerned; and while in these respects he fitly represents the character of that Church, he also stands as one who, by his rank and power, was responsible for her spiritual and moral degradation. The order of prelates, one which was spiritual in its origin, was in later times but a part of the larger order of social aristocrats whose aims were worldly, and whose habits of life were morally gross and politically tyrannical; and whether the Church corrupted the world or the world corrupted the Church, the religious and social life of Scotland before the Reformation had sunk to depths of degradation, and the prelates on the one hand, and the nobles on the other, witnessed to this degradation.

Beaton was guilty of the sins of the prelate and of the vices of the aristocrat: unchaste and worldly he was, and his reputation has paid the full penalty of his sins and vices. Posterity has been more kindly in its treatment of the moral reputation of his great adversary, because he was not a churchman. Yet Henry's morals were as corrupt as Beaton's, and his ecclesiastical tyranny was even more violent: but Henry was a king, and Beaton was a churchman, and posterity, while too merciful to the king, has been pitiless towards the priest.

THE END.

PRINTED BY WILLIAM BLACKWOOD AND SONS.

LIBRARY

HERKLESS, SIR JOHN
AUTHOR
Cardinal Beaton, priest and politician
TITLE
BQX 2169 .B43 H4

DATE	BORROWER'S NAME	ROOM NUMBER

HERKLESS, SIR JOHN
Cardinal Beaton, priest and politician
BQX 2169 .B43 H4